DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 528 UD 024 926

TITLE	Making Urban Schools Effective. Desegregation in Massachusetts 1985-86 Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Quincy. Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity.
PUB DATE	Apr 86
NOTE	191p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Enrollment Trends; *Equal Education; Federal Regulation; *Minority Groups; Refugees; *School Desegregation; State Standards; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Massachusetts; Massachusetts (Boston); Massachusetts (Cambridge); Massachusetts (Holyoke); Massachusetts (Lowell); Massachusetts (New Bedford); Massachusetts (Springfield); Massachusetts (Worcester)

ABSTRACT

This report on urban education in Massachusetts deals specifically with issues of desegregation. In the first section, seven effective, desegregated school districts are profiled: Boston, Cambridge, Holyoke, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield, and Worcester. Following this section is a paper on educational equity for linguistic minority students which asserts that these students are not now being adequately educated and are dropping out of school as a result of their frustration at failing to learn. Recommendations for better servicing them are included. Another essay covers, by geographical area, the education of Southeast Asian and Haitian refugees in the Boston/Cambridge area in 1985-86. This is followed by a section outlining the Massachusetts and Federal requirements with regard to minority students. The final section considers enrollment trends and patterns and gives extensive enrollment by ethnic/racial category in 15 Massachusetts cities. (CG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270528

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

MAKING URBAN SCHOOLS EFFECTIVE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Glenn
MA State Dept. of Ed.
BEEO.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

APRIL 1986

DESEGREGATION IN MASSACHUSETTS
1985-86 ANNUAL REPORT

UD024926

MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. James F. Crain, Gloucester, *Chairperson*
Rev. Paul V. Garrity, Lowell, *Vice Chairperson*

Mr. Christopher H. Collins, Millis
Ms. Milca R. Gonzalez, Shrewsbury
Mr. James R. Grande, Hanover
Mr. Joseph E. Killory, Sandwich
Mr. Sol Kolack, Newton
Mrs. Anne S. Larkin, Bedford
Mrs. Loretta L. Roach, Boston
Mr. Joseph C. Savery, Lee
Ms. Mary Ellen Smith, Boston
Mrs. Mary C. Wright, Falmouth

Ms. Rhoda E. Schneider, *Esquire, Acting Commissioner of Education, Secretary*

Mr. Joseph Finnegan, *Acting Chancellor*, Board of Regents, Ex Officio

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
Charles L. Glenn, *Director*
Michael J. Alves, *Project Director*
Paula T. Willis, *Editor*
Franklin F. Banks
Ivonne LaLyre
Maureen M. Wark
Typing coordinated by Ellen Kanakis

Produced by the Bureau of Operational Support
Cecilia M. DiBella, *Director*
Susan Gardner, *Publications/Communications Coordinator*
Susan M. Stille, *Typographist*

The Massachusetts Department of Education insures equal employment/educational opportunities/affirmative action regardless of race, color, creed, national origin or sex, in compliance with Title IV and Title IX, or handicap, in compliance with section 504.

Publication #14403—190—500—4-86 approved by Daniel D. Carter, *State Purchasing Agent.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

April 1986

TO: Acting Commissioner Rhoda E. Schneider

RE: Annual Desegregation and Equity Report

This report marks a new stage in the mission of the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity.

Two previous reports have summed up the results of past efforts. "Equity, Choice and Effective Urban Education" (April 1985) reviewed the history of desegregation and educational equity in Massachusetts, and featured a number of effective desegregated urban schools. "Family Choice and Public Schools" (January 1986) provided an overview of the policies of parent choice which have done so much to revitalize education in a number of cities in the Commonwealth.

The present report, "Making Urban Schools Effective," focuses less on what has been accomplished than on the new challenges which lie before us. This is not to suggest that no more remains to be done along the familiar lines. There are six school systems currently in the process of developing comprehensive desegregation plans for the first time, while each of the nine that have already desegregated--including Boston--is exploring new options which would enhance integration and equity. Much of our attention is devoted to assisting these efforts, and some of them are described in the present report.

Despite this continuity, however, we have a sense of embarking on a new direction in 1986, one which seeks to consolidate the gains of desegregation and to translate them into effective education for minority students. Several factors have brought us to this point:

- the "maturity" of our major desegregation plans, marked by the removal of Court supervision in Boston and by the obvious success of desegregation in Springfield, Cambridge, Worcester and other cities;

- the clear signal given by the Governor and Legislature, with the strong support of the Board of Education, that public education must become more accountable for results;

- the eagerness of the urban educators with whom we work to focus on developing effective schools, as reflected in an unusually positive response to the recognition of such schools in our report last April, and the conference next month--planned jointly by fifteen cities--on diversity and educational effectiveness; and

- our evolving understanding that educational justice has less to do with procedures than it does with outcomes for students.

Our new emphasis will be marked by several themes in the coming year. None of these is new, but each will be pursued with greater intensity:

1. We have been very explicit with each of the desegregating school systems that their Chapter 636-funded efforts must include an evaluation of educational outcomes. This expectation was spelled out in March 1984 and we have now worked for two years with the desegregation coordinators to help them to develop an in-house capability to produce information directly applicable to school improvement. Springfield has been a model of such efforts for a number of years, and we anticipate that three or four other cities will meet our expectations for 1985-86, with another four in 1986-87. We will give the Board a special report based upon these evaluations in January 1987.

2. Each proposal for Chapter 636 funding for 1986-87 must include a clear identification of those educational barriers to real equity and integration which the funds will address. In the past the peaceful implementation of desegregation has been our primary concern; now that this is largely accomplished, we are asking school systems to turn to the other challenges which will complete the equity agenda.

3. In order to plan and implement school desegregation, each of these cities has developed a Chapter 636-funded planning capacity. Rather than discontinue this with the completion of

desegregation, we are inviting superintendents to use these offices to address other equity-related issues. Just as EEO works with others in the Department of Education to provide an equity focus, so at the local level the desegregation offices are helping with such issues as reform of secondary school programs, dropout prevention, early childhood programs, and support for linguistic minority students.

4. Desegregation will not be complete until real integration has taken place, until we have helped students to develop an appreciation for human diversity--going far beyond "tolerance"--and responsible citizenship in the school as well as the community. We will continue our efforts to improve racial climate through school-initiated projects which support the development of character and a commitment to justice.

The report which follows includes profiles of a number of effective desegregated schools to which we ask the Board to extend special recognition. Michael Alves and Paula Willis identified some of the exemplary characteristics of these schools. We also invited superintendents to describe their equity efforts in their own words.

Maureen Wark discusses recent developments in the education of refugee students, for which my longer essay on linguistic minority students in general provides a context. The October 1985 enrollments by race are provided for schools in the school systems with which we are currently working.

Charles L. Glenn

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Effective Desegregated Schools	7
Boston	12
Cambridge	29
Holyoke	47
Lowell	65
New Bedford	77
Springfield	83
Worcester	101
Educational Equity for Linguistic Minority Students	111
Developments in Refugee Education in 1985-86	149
Massachusetts and Federal Requirements	155
Enrollment Trends and Patterns	161
Enrollment Data By Race	165
Acknowledgements	196

Effective Desegregated Schools

by Michael J. Alves and Paula T. Willis

As the nation and the Commonwealth moves towards improving the quality of public education, we must recognize that the true test of educational reform will come to rest in our urban schools. Although the issues, problems and concerns that are driving the current reform movement are common to all communities, it is particularly compelling in our urban communities. The "felt need" for higher test scores, fewer dropouts, more effective teaching, greater parent satisfaction, higher teacher morale, smaller class size, enriched curricula, and quality and accessible pre-school education, represents only the "tip of the iceberg" of what communities face in their quest for providing an environment that is conducive to making a school effective.

As we strive to implement our "best ideas" about what public schooling ought to be, we must not forget that our most vulnerable and "at risk" children are being educated in predominately urban schools. It is within the urban schoolhouse that the delibitating effects of racism and poverty are confronted each and every day. However, it is also within the urban school that the potentiality of what a quality and holistic education in America ought to be is being worked upon and achieved on a daily basis.

In light of the current reform movement and the prevailing negative image of urban schooling, the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity has actively encouraged each desegregating school system in Massachusetts to identify and describe those schools within their system that best exemplify effective urban education.

Last year, we provided working descriptions of twenty-six desegregating schools which captured the essential ingredients of an effective urban education. These were schools whose accomplishments were generally unknown both within and outside of their communities; that educated a racially, ethnically, and socio-economically diverse student population, with test scores and other indicators of academic achievement rising for children most at risk, and that had nurtured a distinctive home and school relationship where parents were genuinely treated with respect and were seen as true educational partners in the mission of the school.

This year we have asked our urban colleagues to identify even more of these schools in order that they may be profiled in our Annual Report to the State Board of Education. In selecting the schools to be profiled, we were again interested in identifying schools that met the following criteria:

1. **Racial/Ethnic Desegregation:** The student enrollment of the school is consistent with the desegregation standard currently in effect within the system.

2. **Economic Desegregation:** The number of low-income students enrolled in the school is reflective of the proportion of low-income students systemwide.

3. **Educational/Academic Achievement:** The academic achievement level for minority and/or low-income students enrolled in this school has demonstrably improved during the course of school desegregation.

   For example:

   - The level of academic achievement for minority and low-income students in this school is above the systemwide average for minority and low-income students.

   - The level of academic achievement for minority and low-income students is clearly improving within this school.

4. **School Recognition:** This school has not received special recognition for its desegregation-related accomplishments outside of the local school system.

Of the seventeen schools that were chosen this year, they are representative of the wide range of urban schools that are found throughout the Commonwealth. They are also categorized as distinctive because of their diversity and in particular because of their effectiveness in successfully meeting the mandates and challenges that face urban educators today. In order to facilitate the development of the school profiles, we asked each to respond to seven questions which we felt addressed the key issues inherent in an effective urban school.

1. Why should minority and majority race parents enroll their children in this school - what makes this an educationally effective desegregated school?

   For example:

   Educational Leadership
   Distinctive Teaching and Learning Style
   Academic, Behavioral, and Attitudinal Standards and Expectations
   School Climate/Learning Environment
   Special Programs or Enhanced Educational Opportunities
   External or Supplemental Resources
   Quality of Instruction
   Student/Teacher Evaluations

2. How does this school promote a positive inter-racial learning environment and otherwise ensure that minority and low-income students are equitably treated and have equal access to the school's educational programs, services, courses of study, and co-curricula activities?

3. How has the quality of education demonstrably improved for minority and low-income students in this school and how do you account for this success?

4. How do minority and majority race parents interact with this school (formal and informal means of participation) and can you demonstrate that this involvement makes a difference in explaining the effectiveness of the school?

   Parent Councils/PTA
   School Visitations (Parent and school initiated)
   School Volunteers
   Instructional Support at Home and in School

5. If this school enrolls students whose first language is not English, what approaches have you found particularly effective in promoting their achievement and integration?

6. Does this school have a distinctive philosophy or educational mission which expresses itself in teaching and discipline and which makes it particularly attractive to certain minority and majority race parents and students? If so, please describe.

7. If another school had a similar student/parent population, what concrete advice would you give them in making their school an effective desegregated school?

LEA	SCHOOL	GRADE LEVEL	MAGNET (M) NON-MAGNET (NM)	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	MINORITY
BOSTON	Higginson	K-5	NM	197	81%
	Lee	K-5	NM	563	81%
	Lewenberg Middle	6-8	NM	379	82%
CAMBRIDGE	Fitzgerald	K-8	M	410	52%
	Harrington	K-8	M	621	38%
	Longfellow	K-8	M	477	41%
HOLYOKE	Kelly	4-6	M	581	67%
	McMahon	K-3	M	506	51%
	Morgan	K-3	M	309	66%
LOWELL	Arts Magnet	K-8	M	148	33%
	Greenhalge	K-4	M	582	30%
SPRINGFIELD	Armory Street	K,5,6	M	537	57%
	Indian Orchard	K-4	NM	418	40%
	White Street	K-4	NM	430	50%
WORCESTER	Adams Street	K-6	M	179	43%
	Burncoat Middle	7-8	M	529	35%
	Elm Park	K-6	M	639	52%

Boston

The story of desegregation in Boston has been told in at least eight books, from the perspectives of participants, of social scientists, and of journalists, and ranging from the scholarly to the quasi-fictional. The story of the State role has never been accurately told, however, nor has that of hundreds of Boston staff and parents who worked hard to make desegregation a success for children. Those who have been closest to this evolving story over the years know that, despite countless blunders and lost opportunities, there has been steady progress in dozens of desegregated schools.

The three school profiles which follow, and the ten schools profiled in our report last year, are examples of this success in the face of countless difficulties. Hard work and sensitive response to the needs of urban students are unfortunately not "news," but they deserve recognition by the Board of Education and by everyone concerned with educational equity.

Before the profiles, and in place of the general review of desegregation provided for the other communities included in this report, implementation of the new desegregation measures approved by Judge Garrity in February 1985 are discussed at some length. This discussion, based upon extensive site visits and review of data, is critical of many aspects of implementation, though recognizing efforts at several schools and the usual high quality of the assignment process itself.

Boston Superintendent Laval Wilson has spoken frequently of his interest in developing a more flexible approach to student assignments, within the context of the desegregation plan. The discussion of how the new measures approved more than a year ago have been carried out should suggest the need for a commitment to implementation which goes beyond

the Department of Implementation, and to flexibility in the assignment process itself.

Since May 1975, when the assignment orders in essentially their present form were issued, other Massachusetts cities have faced the same challenge of desegregation and, learning from Boston's experiences, have developed approaches which allow for flexibility and simplicity of operation without compromising the goals of desegregation. Boston could now begin to learn from the successful experience of other desegregating communities in Massachusetts. The support of the State Board to such approaches in other communities should reassure Boston that proposals which include adequate safeguards will meet a sympathetic response.

Following the discussion of implementation of the new assignment modifications, by Frank F. Banks, is a letter in which Superintendent Wilson states his equity agenda for the school system.

BOSTON'S 'EXPERIMENTAL' STUDENT ASSIGNMENT MODIFICATIONS

by Franklin F. Banks

On December 20, 1984 the Boston School Committee and the School Department presented a proposal to the Federal Court to modify existing desegregation orders regarding student assignments. Among ten specific modifications requested there were three distinct plans for "experimental" assignment models: The Districts 3 and 4 Consolidated Plan, the Recruitment Incentive Plan, and the Neighborhood Enchancement Plan.

The Revised Sudent Assignment Procedure in Districts 3 and 4

The School Committee proposed a revised approach to making student assignments, to be tried out on a pilot basis in a consolidated district made up of the former districts 3 and 4. In its filing the Committee noted that

> The success of this proposal in maintaining an acceptable degree of desegregation in the District depends on the efforts of principals, faculties and parent councils--with the aggressive support of the Superintendent and the Central Staff--to encourage a

racially mixed group of students to attend their schools.

This acknowledges the validity of a point made repeatedly in State monitoring reports, that assignment measures alone cannot bear the whole burden of making desegregation work.

The Committee described their goal in proposing the revised assignment process as follows:

> The purpose of these assignment procedures is to achieve a stable, desegregated assignment of students to non-magnet schools within the Consolidated District which, to the greatest extent consistent with the desegregation goals set forth herein, permits parents to choose the school which their children will attend.

The Districts 3 and 4 (now consolidated as District B) assignment modification offered parents several guaranteed choices, as well as the opportunity to request other assignments which were not guaranteed. Every student was given an absolute right to attend the present school (unless moving on to middle school, of course) or the "geocoded" school, if different. Minority students were also offered guaranteed assignments to a number of schools in White residential areas, while White students were offered guaranteed assignments to a number of schools in Black residential areas. Parents could also request a citywide magnet school (subject to the regular assignment provisions) or a non-guaranteed school in the district, though chances of obtaining the latter were slim. Each parent could make up to five choices.

The Recruitment Incentive Plan

The School Committee also proposed modifications allowing certain schools to "recruit" students from outside of their ordinary assignment areas, subject to specific limitations designed to support desegregation.

The Recruitment Incentive Plan includes twenty-six schools and all schools in District 8 (East Boston), and designates for each school a specific number of reserved seats in one or more of three racial categories (Black, White, Other Minority) to be filled by students not geocoded to that school. The purpose of this plan was to provide more choice by allowing underenrolled schools to move toward capacity by enrolling students who would enhance the desegregation of the school.

The Neighborhood Enchancement Plan

This plan includes only two schools, the Elihu Greenwood and the Mather. It was designed to increase choice by allowing students who live in the racially mixed neighborhoods contiguous to these two schools to choose those schools. Specific street boundaries were established to determine who could apply and the actual assignments were made when the number of available seats were determined after geocoded assignments were completed.

Outcomes

Generally the Districts 3 and 4 consolidated plan has been the most successful of the three assignment "experiments." Its success has, however, been limited, and lies mostly in the utilization by parents of the new assignment process to choose non-geocoded schools. The following is a breakdown of district 3 and 4 residents who chose and were assigned to non-geocoded elementary schools in the consolidated district:

December 1985--Grades 1-5

	Black	White	Other Minority		Totals
District 3	131	57	16	=	204
District 4	137	38	8	=	183
	268 (69%)	95 (25%)	24 (6%)	=	387

It is hoped that because these parents and students have received their choices of schools their satisfaction with the chosen schools and the system as a whole will have increased.

The actual desegregation gains of the Districts 3 and 4 plan are modest at best. Six of the sixteen schools in the district showed modest increases in the percentage of white students enrolled, as compared to 1984-85 percentages, while nine showed modest decreases and one remained the same. Eight schools showed increases in the total number of white students enrolled as compared to 1984-85 enrollments, while seven showed decreases and one remained the same. To further cloud this ambiguous picture, two elementary schools were closed at the end of the 1984-85 school year in the

consolidated district, creating substantial increases in enrollments in those schools to which students were reassigned.

Two other positive aspects of the plan are that the overall enrollment of the consolidated district went from 3,141 in 1984-85 to 3,207 in 1985-86, an increase of 66 students, and the number of district 3 and 4 residents attending non-district schools (magnet schools and other programmatic choices) decreased by 70 students. The substantial utilization of choice, and the increase in the choice of district schools are positive signs about the potential of this plan to satisfy parents and eventually to enhance desegregation.

By comparison the other two plans appear to have had more limited success and may have increased the frustration of parents and school administrators. The actual statistical results on the success of these two plans, though requested several times, were not made available for Department of Education review by the Boston School Department.

Fifteen of the special assignment schools were visited for this Report. From talking with most of the principals and headmasters and many other staff (both district and school-based), it appears that all three plans have problems--the Recruitment Incentive Plan and the Neighborhood Enhancement Plan more serious problems. These problems can be divided into two broad categories: (1) Problems in getting recruitment efforts operational, problems in promoting and accommodating changes in schools (Implementation); and (2) problems in the design and interpretation of each plan in producing enhanced desegregation outcomes (Design/Interpretation).

IMPLEMENTATION

Despite the fact that all three plans were developed and presented to the Federal Court with specific schools identified as early as January 1985 and even targeted for highest priority for Chapter 636 funding in the 636 Guidelines presented to Boston in February 1985, most schools did very little to actively recruit students before school opened in the Fall of 1985. There were some major exceptions: Districts 3 and 4 held a recruitment forum at the Irving School in the Spring of 1985 in which all Districts 3 and 4 schools participated; significant recruitment efforts were made under the Recruitment

Incentive Plan in the old District 2 (Kennedy, Ellis, Curley, Manning); there were also successful recruitment efforts at the Lee School in District 3; and, although not targeted as a recruitment school, the Lewenberg conducted its own program, recruiting geocoded but non-attending students with surprising success.

The Lee School not only developed brochures and other information to mail to parents but encouraged active telephone and face-to-face contacts between parents with children attending the school and other parents whose children were not enrolled. Visits to the school by prospective parents were encouraged, and school staff were cooperating with all recruitment efforts. By contrast most school principals did not have a clear idea of who or how they were supposed to recruit and consequently did little. The Department of Implementation sent some informational materials to the schools involved and to parents eligible for the Neighborhood Enhancement Plan, and the Department of Implementation offered to provide mailing lists (with address labels) to those schools wishing to mail school recruitment materials. Little, however, was done by the school system to encourage schools to launch aggressive recruitment efforts such as those described for the Lee and District 2.

As the 1983-84 monitoring under the Federal Court revealed, Boston has made assignments correctly but has not made concerted and aggressive efforts to assure that these assignments become maximally effective in enhancing desegregation, especially through efforts at the school level, such as outreach to parents. The experiences of the Lee School and the Lewenberg point to the potential of such school-based efforts for increasing enrollments and enhancing desegregation. Their experiences and those of District 2 parent recruiters have revealed two major benefits to face-to-face and parent-to-parent contacts: (1) To provide first-hand and persuasive information about a school from a satisfied user, and (2) to dispell the false and outdated perceptions about a school or the system as a whole which may have prevented serious consideration.

Despite several technical assistance efforts by the Department of Education--including participants from Cambridge, Lowell, and Worcester--in the Spring of 1985, and a briefing for Community District Superintendents and their staff, the school visits these past months have made it very clear that few principals have a clear idea of their own responsibilities under the new assignment provisions, or of the most effective approaches to reaching prospective parents.

Although the principals of the Elihu Greenwood and Mather Schools received written information from the Department of Implementation and from the Citywide Education Coalition describing the Neighborhood Enhancement Plan and procedures for application, they were not told how many and who (by race) would be assigned. They reported that they had no direct contacts with the Department of Implementation prior to the Fall. In both cases, even after school started, the principals did not know exactly who or how many students had been assigned under the plan. Both did meet with interested parents who came to the school to investigate assignment possibilities. The principals felt frustrated by their inability to respond to parent inquiries about the likelihood of actual assignment.

In the Winter (1985-86) the Department of Implementation held informational meetings at each of the two schools to discuss the Neighborhood Enhancement Plan with the parents of kindergarten students. Kindergarten parents attending the meeting at the Greenwood (most of whom were White) expressed considerable dissatisfaction with (1) the timing of the special assignment decisions which would occur at the earliest in June and (2) the inability of the Department of Implementation representative to provide any information regarding how many or who, by race, would be assigned under this plan. In addition to these problems the principal of the Mather School claims his school is reaching what he considers its realistic capacity and really cannot accommodate many additional students.

Most Recruitment Incentive schools were given no instructions or advice about outreach to prospective parents before school opened in September 1985. Many principals did not know how many reserved seats had been designated for their schools in the materials filed with the Court in January 1985, or who, by race, was eligible. With few exceptions, principals and community district superintendents interviewed this Winter did not know that students were to be recruited from outside of a Recruitment Incentive School's usual geocodes to fill the reserved seats.

The main exceptions were in District 2, where a recruitment project had begun in February 1985 with state funding. Several schools made a notable and fairly successful effort to recruit, only to run into new frustrations as recruited parents were given "geocoded" assignments instead, with corrections coming only during the summer. Even more seriously, no additional support was available to assure that parents who volunteered their children would be

satisfied with the results, a cardinal principle of all such efforts. At the John F. Kennedy School, for example, the effect of recruiting eighteen additional students was to raise class sizes significantly in the first grade, and thus make the school less rather than more attractive to parents who had volunteered their children.

Last Spring the community district superintendents were given a list of "Twelve Elements of Successful Desegregation Recruitment," based on experience elsewhere in the Commonwealth. School visits this Winter have made it clear that those lessons were largely ignored. The question now is whether Boston will learn from its own experience.

Design/Interpretation

When actual assignments were made in the late Spring and Summer of 1985 several serious problems in the design and interpretation of the three new assignment plans became apparent. The most serious were seen in the Recruitment Incentive Plan and the Neighborhood Enhancement Plan. The major problems are as follows:

1. Many parents complained about the lateness in the year with which special assignment decisions are made. Some parents who were interested in one of the special recruitment schools, chose either not to apply or chose not to send their child after applying because applications and initial payments for private and parochial schools are required as early as January. To some parents dealing with Boston's present application process under the new plans presents too many uncertainties. Added to the lateness of actual assignments, they face the possibility of receiving an "unrequested" assignment with no recourse to private or parochial choices later on. In order to avoid this possibility, some have chosen not to consider Boston schools at all.

   To reduce some of these concerns Boston should work to: (a) integrate the "special assignments" into the regular assignment process so that parents do not receive a "regular" geocoded assignment in May and then a "special" assignment in June or later; (b) provide as much certainty about the likelihood of actual assignment to parents as possible, by expanding the concept of "guaranteed choices," now used in the District 3 and 4 Plan, and by making reasonable projections of school enrollments by race as early as

possible in informational meetings with prospective parents.

2. In a similar vein, principals and recruitment specialist in District 2 complained that many Whites who were recruited for specific schools were not assigned despite unfilled reserved seats for White students at those schools, because of the impact on the geocoded school. That is, these White students were not given their assignment choice, according to the Department of Implementation, because they were geocoded to attend schools also in need of White students to meet minimal racial guidelines established for the district. In some cases, the disappointed parents of these White students chose not to send their children to any Boston Public School, so that desegregation was enhanced at neither the geocoded school nor the special recruitment school.

   This lack of assignment flexibility has also produced a ripple effect among parents who, seeing their friends and neighbors denied their choice, have little faith that the new assignment options are worth pursuing at all.

3. In both Neighborhood Enhancement Plan schools, the percentage of geocoded White students enrolled is at or beyond the limit established for Whites in the respective districts. This creates the likelihood that additional Whites will not be assigned under this plan. The Department of Implementation has based the assignment of students under this plan on the number of seats available in the school by race after geocoded assignments are completed. White kindergarten parents at the Greenwood expressed considerable displeasure at the design of this assignment plan and predicted its almost certain failure if carried out as planned. Boston might consider establishing a certain percentage (e.g., 25%) of seats for "neighborhood students," and racial guidelines for that percentage of the school population based on the racial balance of the neighborhood.

In brief, several serious problems involving assignment flexibility, school capacity, timing of assignments, and the "afterthought" nature of special recruitment assignments have seriously compromised the success of these new assignment options, especially the Recruitment Incentive Plan and the Neighborhood Enhancement Plan. Poorly coordinated and half-hearted recruitment and follow-through

efforts could further alienate prospective parents, for whom these plans were designed in the first place. Serious thought should be given to the resolution of these problems, including more rigorous and better coordinated recruitment efforts, especially at the school level, and more flexibility used in actual assignments. There is already some evidence that recruitment efforts may be improving, although the hiring of a citywide recruitment coordinator, funded by the state and scheduled for January 1986, has not occurred as of late March.

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT
LAVAL S. WILSON

January 6, 1986

Dr. Charles Glenn
Director of Equal Educational Opportunity
Massachusetts Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Dear Dr. Glenn:

Equality of opportunity is fundamental to justice in our society, but it is difficult to achieve. With great effort and at great cost, the Boston Public Schools have achieved substantial compliance with orders of the federal court regarding desegregation. It is a great victory, but without parallel victories in employment and housing, and without equalization among cities and towns, it threatens to be a victory that may not fully yield the desired results in terms of improved lives for Boston's students and graduates.

To be meaningful in our students' lives, equality of opportunity must not be interpreted narrowly as equal access to public schooling within a single community, but as equal access to public schooling on a par with all communities in the state. For Boston, setting parity with surrounding communities as a goal means upgrading the quality of our academic programs, upgrading the quality of our buildings, and increasing and upgrading the quality of interaction between homes and schools.

As Boston moves into its second decade of desegregated education, I look to lead the schools in a campaign to achieve parity with surrounding communities. We will dedicate our resources, supplemented by those of the state, to academic improvement, improving school climate, and building our community of parents through greater attention to their needs. Our goal will be better lives for our students, lives in which the words equity, integration and choice are synonomous with dignity and quality.

Sincerely,

Laval S. Wilson

Laval S. Wilson
Superintendent

26 COURT STREET • BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • 726-6200 AREA 617

HENRY L.HIGGINSON SCHOOL - by school staff

Racial harmony and a spirit of togetherness are characteristics that have been evident in the Henry L. Higginson School for many years. To seek out one specific reason for this success, or to believe that there is a formula that all schools can follow, based on our experience, would be erroneous.

Although we did not set out to develop a step-by-step format, we soon discovered that certain elements were present in each area.

Involvement in the School Based Management project in many ways helped to get parents to be more than signers of report cards. They became partners in the school with the teachers and principal. As barriers lowered, all parties became more comfortable planning and discussing school needs and directions. As the parents realized that the schools were really open to them, many parents stopped taking the schools for granted. This attitude "trickled down" to the children because we saw an increase in enthusiasm on their part, as will be pointed out in the next section.

Improved attendance from kindergarten to Grade 5 has been a goal of this school that has worked. Parents and staff made this an objective for our children. Monthly awards ceremonies are held in which pupils with perfect attendance receive recognition in an assembly format, in which they are awarded perfect attendance citations. Attendance averages 93% now.

This monthly program brings increased pride within each classroom and throughout the building. There is a positive spirit of competition that provides positive results. All children within a classroom are truly working to be #1. This brings about a huge increase in classroom and building pride.

Along with the gradual move toward neighborhood integration, the establishment of two Extended Day Kindergarten classes in the Higginson School was a key factor in increasing white enrollment. After a few years, the white parents who participated in the Extended Day Kindergarten program were able to have their children continue through the elementary grades, rather than be "geocoded" to other schools for Grade 1 and beyond. This stability of assignment was another important factor in our success.

The Principal spent a great deal of time working with and demonstrating to parents that their children would receive a quality, integrated education. Word spread from satisfied parents to friends that the area and the school offered a great deal.

Project Challenge, a Chapter 636 exemplary program, is directed toward meeting the needs of students in each grade level who show above-average potential in mathematics and/or language arts. Independent classes are set up for the benefit of these students over and above those classes attended in the regular classroom. The program operates from January through June, and it has received favorable comments in each year of its operation. Project Challenge allows the regular classroom teacher more time to devote to those students who need more individual help.

A positive approach to discipline--that is, involving parents prior to any problems developing--alerts both parents and children to know what is expected of them. We at the school work with the parents and children to be absolutely certain that all children are treated fairly, and when a problem arises, all sides are able to be heard. This brings the home and the child in on the ground floor when decision-making is made.

What we do can be described best by taking an excerpt from our "School Profile":

"High expectations at the Henry L. Higginson School begin in the two Extended Day Programs, where all children are challenged from the first day of school. All pupils at the Higginson are challenged to reach the highest levels of achievement, both academically and behaviorally. Children start out their school careers eager and anxious to learn. Somehow, in some cases, many of these youngsters lose their enthusiasm before too long. We see to it that this enthusiasm is nurtured, and we make each day a learning experience in the truest sense. The good start is the key. We face this challenge with a positive attitude."

Time and patience are two factors that must be present when undertaking a project of this type. Everyone must be willing to work with the realization that success will not be achieved overnight. The parents, teachers, and administrators must communicate and show trust in one another.

JOSEPH LEE SCHOOL - by school staff

1. The Joseph Lee School is a modern, well equipped school which was opened in 1971. It houses students from kindergarten to grade 5. The school is an open space school. Teachers are dedicated to the philosophy of team teaching and individualized instruction. Special programs include Art, Music, Library, Physical Education, Swimming, and Computer. Children with talent are invited to enrichment classes afternoons.

   For the talented and gifted students we have a Chapter 636 funded program which is called Act I, Act II, and Act III. This supplies 90 days of funding for an extra teacher in grades one, two, and three. These teachers take groups of ten in Reading, Language Arts, Mathematics, and Creative Thinking with a goal of advancing selected students two grades in one year.

   Chapter 766 classes are available for autistic children, Early Childhood Students, Social Academic Remediation Students, Learning Adaptive Students, and Resource Students.

2. All children at the Lee School participate in all activities described above.

3. Children receive a high quality education due to the fact that we have programs to meet the needs of all levels. Mainstreaming of Chapter 766 children and Kindergarten Bilingual Students is definitely encouraged. Needless to say, the teachers are highly interested in having all children succeed.

4. Parents are encouraged to participate in the School Parent Council, the Home and School, and the School Volunteers Programs at the school. Some parents are more active than others, but all have demonstrated a positive support to the school through participation in Field Trips, Cake Sales, and other events which require parent assistance.

5. Concerning children whose first language is not English, we test them. If necessary, we recommend placement in a Bilingual Program.

6. One facet of our program which has not been mentioned is our Theater Arts Program. Since we have a fully

equipped theater we have as an overall theme a performing arts focus. Children are encouraged to participate in our many performances. The children make the scenery, decorate the theater, and join the Chorus and Instrumental Groups. Performances are, also, brought in, and all have an opportunity to see them.

7. An effective desegregated school must project a good image. Standards for discipline, academics, and maintenance of plant must be very high. Adequate staffing and materials must be in evidence.

   Principal and teachers must make parents and children welcome. A warm, caring atmosphere is a must.

THE LEWENBERG MIDDLE SCHOOL - by school staff

The Lewenberg Middle School offers the following programs, courses, specialized teaching and administrative guidance which makes the school not only an outstanding effective desegregated school, but one that is attractive to majority and minority parents for the following reasons:

I. Strong educational and administrative leadership.

   Specialized programs geared towards accommodating various groups of students.

   High teacher/student expectations regarding all matters pertaining to the school environment.

   Special School Programs--Chapter 636 Components:
   1. Parent Outreach/Recruitment/Computer Program
   2. Career Education guest speaker component
   3. Boston College Reading Component for Special Needs and Bilingual students
   4. Math Component (schoolwide)
   5. A.I.P. Enrichment Component (Science, Art, and Journalism/English Language Arts)

   John Hancock Heart Grants
   1. Making the Reading/Writing Connection
   2. Lasers Have "Heart" Lewenberg Student Leadership Program Impact II Mini Grants

Impact II Mini Grants
1. Project Beam--Bilingual Education Arts Mainstreaming Program in Home Economics
2. Computer/Reluctant Reader Program
3. Computer and Industrial Arts

Black Achievers Program in conjunction with Isabella Stuart Gardner Museum.
Finalist for:
(NCTE) National recognition program to become a Center of Excellence for the teaching of writing skills.

Outstanding Reading Program which includes:
1. Read-Aloud Program
2. Silent Reading Program
3. Reading Dragon Program--Over 450 books have been read since September of 1985 by students and staff, each getting a piece of the tail indicating a book read.

Choral Program: Multicultural awareness is enhanced by participation of over 65 students.

Mini-Course Program
The entire student population (365) is enrolled in a mini-course of their choosing. Approximately 25 courses are offered.

Computer Lab/Word Processing for all students.

II. The administration closely supervises and develops a school schedule which ensures that all students have, not only equal educational opportunity, but equal access to all programs. Teachers and administrators actively engage students to participate in and develop many inter-cultural programs. Classes are racially balanced. Cooperation of Central Office administration helps develop programs which expand our range of offerings and allows us to achieve higher levels of cultural awareness.

III. The quality of education has demonstrably improved for minority and low-income students as can be seen from the results of:
1. Promotion Policy - 95% promoted
2. Attendance Policy - 90% attendance
3. Increased test scores on: DRP's, CRT's, Metro Achievement

4. Increased number of Bilingual students mainstreamed into regular education programs
5. Increased school spirit/pride as demonstrated by:
   a. School Clean-Up Day--over 150 participated
   b. Decorated Corridors/displays
   c. Awards ceremonies, fund raisers, intramural sports programs, choral program, student council participation
6. Increased parental participation in school functions

IV. Increased parental participation manifests itself in increased turnout to all school functions
   1. School Parent Council
   2. School Volunteers for Boston

V. The approach used by the Lewenberg to promote high academic achievement in non-primary English speaking students is to fully cooperate with the Department of Bilingual Education and to recruit as many good teachers as possible. State-mandated and Federal guidelines are adhered to and a close working relationship exists between the Bilingual teachers, principal, Director of Instruction, and Assistant Principal as well as other staff to achieve a high level of academic performance.

VI. The Lewenberg's basic school philosophy--"Every child can and will learn" is the result of caring teachers and parents. We strongly believe that teachers can and do make a difference in the quality of a student's educational life. The teachers at the Lewenberg are prepared to accept this responsibility and carry out the mandates and goals as expressed by the Boston Public Schools' policies.

VII. Design and implement a realistic program that fits the needs of the student population. Strive to acquire strong and effective teachers. Maintain high standards of behavioral and academic excellence. Engage your students, parents and teachers to make the school as culturally broad-based as possible. Continually elicit the best from everyone within your school environment.

Cambridge

The first racial balance plan for Cambridge was adopted in 1965, under pressure from the Board of Education; it included construction of three new schools with increased capacities and enlarged attendance areas, and a policy prohibiting any student transfer which would have a negative effect on racial balance.

New schools were built, but without appropriate redistricting, and the Board made repeated findings of racial imbalance over the years. Because of the much more critical desegregation problems in Boston and Springfield, however, Cambridge did not come under really focused investigation and technical assistance until 1978.

An initial planning grant under Chapter 636 generated an analysis of assignment data which showed that nearly 1,100 students had been allowed to transfer in violation of the system's own "neighborhood school" policy and transfer policy with the effect of actually increasing minority isolation. Our subsequent review found a clear relation between practices of the school system and the existence of racially segregated schools. We shared this information with the Superintendent, members of the School Committee, and the attorney advising them on these matters, and obtained agreement on a process of developing a remedial plan.

Cambridge was the first school system with which we began a remedial process prior to any formal finding of liability through a negotiation strategy which has subsequently proved effective with other systems. It was also the first system with which we moved from the Massachusetts Racial Imbalance Law to the United States Constitution as the primary standard for remedy, thus assuring a plan which would be

more broadly adequate than the racial balance plans ordered by the Board for Boston and Springfield in 1973.

In developing a plan, therefore, Cambridge leadership had to be concerned not only with achieving enrollments less than 50% "non-white" but also with assuring that student assignments and educational opportunities were equitable in every respect. This was a challenge which nearly everyone could support.

The first stage, implemented in 1979, corrected the abuses of voluntary transfers and strenghened the magnet schools; the second, in 1980, redistricted a number of schools and closed one; the third and final stage, in 1981, merged two magnet schools, paired two other schools (with grades K-4 and 5-8), closed another, and introduced a new assignment policy in lieu of attendance districts.

This assignment policy deserves and is beginning to receive national attention for its reconciliation of significant parental choice with solid desegregation. Each student entering the system at the K-8 level must select four schools by order of preference, and is then assigned on the basis of space availability, feasibility of transportation, and desegregation.

It should be noted that the voluntary enrollment plan builds upon prior measures to correct past segregation and establish desegregated schools, and serves as a permanent protection against resegregation as neighborhoods and school-age population change. It should never again be necessary to reassign students to desegregate in Cambridge, since constant adjustment is possible through assignment of students newly entering the system.

The success of the Cambridge Plan may be attributed not only to imaginative planning and integrity in implementation, but also to an unusual effort to involve the community and especially parents in every step of the process. The broad-based support which the Plan enjoys has helped to build commitment to the Cambridge Public Schools.

Charles L. Glenn

-30-

DESEGREGATION AND QUALITY EDUCATION IN CAMBRIDGE:

PEOPLE MAKE THE DIFFERENCE

by Dorothy S. Jones

Between 1979 and 1981, Cambridge implemented various desegregation steps, with the permanent plan being put into operation in September, 1981. At that point, local attendance zones were abolished and all schools became "magnet" schools in that they all began to compete for students citywide. All thirteen elementary schools are now fully desegregated. They offer teaching styles ranging from the very traditional to the very open, with all the various steps in between. No two schools are exactly alike, so there is much to chose from.

The final implementation went so smoothly that people from outside the city tend to say, "Well, Cambridge is different -- it is a liberal city. That's why they had no trouble." In fact, Cambridge is really no different from most cities. It has its liberals and its conservatives. It suffers from the same racial and class attitudes one can find in any city. What made the difference was the number of people of all backgrounds who got involved in desegregation planning and implementation, assuring a strong constituency for the plan, then and now.

The planning team started with meetings in school buildings in the various areas of the city, talking with parents, teachers and any other interested parties who chose to come. From those meetings, we enlisted people who were willing to host meetings in their homes and invite their own friends and neighbors who, for whatever reason, did not come to the school-based meetings. Desegregation planners and central administrators attended these house meetings -- with three or four or a dozen people -- many of them uncertain about or opposed to desegregation. We answered their questions, solicited their ideas, calmed their fears, and arranged for additional meetings, while we drank numerous cups of coffee and tea and consumed uncounted pastries over a three-month period. One day, we even had an open-air meeting in the center court of a large housing project, complete with our ubiquitous coffee urn and pastry tray, to discuss the issues with the tenants!

Out of these meetings came the refinement of two unique features of our system: the central student assignment policy and the Parent Information Center. These are worth describing in some detail.

Margaret Gallagher is, in many ways, typical of the parents with whom she now works. When she first heard rumors of impending desegregation, she and her husband immediately decided they would have to move their two children to parochial schools. She was an active PTA leader in the Harrington School, so she felt she also had a responsibility to her fellow parents to get more information for them. She talked to her principal, then to the superintendent, and was invited to attend some planning meetings. She became interested, then involved, then committed. In 1981-82, Margaret worked as a Student Advocate in the Kennedy School, helping students there deal with their attitudes and fears about desegregation. Since 1982, Mrs. Gallagher has been the Citywide Parent Coordinator for the Office of Desegregation, recruiting, interviewing, training and supervising the Parent Liaisons who are the backbone of the Parent Information Center.

In every school that did not already have a parent worker on the staff -- and that was most of the schools in the system -- we have placed a part-time Parent Liaison. These are men and women who have been active in the school and/or the community, who work with the parents, teachers and administrators in their own school and in our central Parent Information Center. They publish monthly newsletters providing information about the school, the system and the community that is of interest to parents. They assist in recruitment of parents for early kindergarten registration; they assist in central registration during busy times; they conduct tours of their schools so parents may have the information they need to make informed choices; they help parents, especially those new parents who are from outside the former district of their school, become involved in school activities; they are the visible symbol of the value of parent participation in the Cambridge schools.

The Parent Information Center has become the place parents come to or call for any problems or questions they may have. We have information not only about the school system, but also about such services as pre-school programs, after school care, fuel assistance, health services, the juvenile court, etc.

In the past, when a parent wanted to enroll their child in school, they simply went to the neighborhood

school and did so, as in most cities. When we entered our final phase of desegregation, we wanted to ensure that all parents understood their right and responsibility to chose the school(s) they wanted for their child. We also wanted to be able to ensure consistent and equitable dissemination of information and application of the rules. Therefore, all registration of children new to the system, and all requests for transfer within the system are now handled centrally. Parents are encouraged to visit schools and ask questions before registration, then are asked to list their choice of schools in rank order.

Once this is done, Peter Colleary, Student Assignment Officer and former Peabody School teacher, makes all the assignments. Placements are made based on the parent's choice, limited only by space availabilty and the need for racial balance. Those who do not get their first choice may ask to be placed on a waiting list for the next suitable vacancy in that school, while accepting another assignment.

For the past year and a half, superintendent Robert Peterkin has had us working at all levels setting long and short range goals. We started with some system-wide goals, approved by the School Committee, then worked down to the point where every member of the system has been involved in goal-setting. The goals are specific, quantified and have a time-line. They will be reviewed and up-dated annually. Administrators, teachers and parents have been inspired to work to make a good school system better. We have begun to take a look at what we are doing, how we are doing it, and to see if we can do better; to identify the problem areas and develop solutions.

We are pleased, this year, to present three elementary schools that serve fully desegregated student bodies that include many low-income students and that are beginning to show the kind of progress for which we are all striving.

MICHAEL E. FITZGERALD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The main building of the Fitzgerald School in Cambridge was opened in 1956. In 1965, an eight room addition was built, to accomodate an increase in the number of children in the neighborhood. The plant, because it has been well maintained, is still an attractive place within which to learn and teach.

The former neighborhood zone of the school, where nearly half of the students still live, is extremely diverse. There are still a few of the old Franco-American families in the area, and an even larger remnant of the formerly predominate Irish-American families, perhaps the best known of them being U.S. House Speaker Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill, Jr. Newer families are from a variety of ethnic groups.

Fitzgerald students come from stately old homes, high rise apartments, single family as well as two and three-decker frame buildings and public housing developments. Many parents who choose the Fitzgerald tell us it is because they graduated from it, even though, in some cases, they now live in other parts of the city.

The present student body of the Fitzgerald, 417 in all, is 50% White, 29% Black, 13% Asian and 8% Hispanic. There is also a single Native American child in attendance, contributing to the diversity. More than half of the students live outside what used to the the Fitzgerald attendance zone; 41.8% are low income; 11% receive bilingual education services; and 22.8% are served by the Bureau of Pupil Services.

Principal Paul Mahoney is on leave, acting as Facilties Manager for the system. Richard Calnan, principal of the Lincoln School until it was closed in 1982, is in charge. The staff of the Fitzgerald includes nine men -- one minority; and 34 women -- eight of them minority.

An important part of the tradition of the Fitzgerald is discipline, which includes teaching and expecting older students to assume responsibility for themselves and for

younger students. All Cambridge saw the result of this approach several years ago. A busload of students, kindergarten through eighth grade, were en route to, but still some distance away from, the Fitzgerald when the bus driver felt ill. He managed to pull over and stop the bus before he collapsed. No one would have blamed the students if they had simply sat on the bus and waited for the help that would have come, eventually.

However, they didn't wait. After using a nearby telephone to call for help for the driver -- who, it turned out, had had a heart attack -- the students left the bus and lined up by twos, led by an eighth grade girl, to march the rest of the way to school. When people marveled at what they did, the students couldn't understand why anyone was surprised. They only did what they knew they were supposed to do.

That sense of responsibility carries over into other activities, also. Eighth grade students, with the help of their parents, raise the money for the flowers and other expensive necessities for graduation, instead of leaving it to the individual students and families to cover the costs.

The overall teaching and administrative style at the Fitzgerald is the most traditional of the Cambridge schools featured this year. Even here, however, teachers have a great deal of flexibility to teach in the manner in which they feel most comfortable and to which the children respond most effectively. Within the broad framework of prescribed curricula, teachers free to vary and adapt the curriculum to the unique needs of the children.

There is one seventh grade classroom from which the painters who refurbish the building during the summer have been barred. The reason? The teacher has helped his students do their own painting. They have painted a map of the United States and a map of Cambridge on the walls.

When, three years ago, the number of students from India who are of limited English proficiency became large enough to warrant establishing a TBE program for them, the program was put at the Fitzgerald, where they quickly became an integral part of the school. One youngster, who has "graduated" to a mainstream class, is known to the entire faculty for his ability to come up with a new joke every day, which he will tell whenever a faculty member sees him in the corridor and asks, "Do you have a joke for me today?"

The Fitzgerald has a computer lab with twelve computers, to which all students have access. This year,

plans are under way for a group of seventh graders to share the expertise they have developed by teaching a group of second graders to use the computers.

Five primary grade teachers and a group of parents are very busy working with the new Literacy Center that has been established at the school with the assistance of consultant Donald Holdaway. Dr. Holdaway is a New Zealander who, along with such other experts as Sylvia Ashton-Warner, has pioneered in the "natural" teaching of reading. In the center, children in grades k-3 have the opportunity to read aloud together, following with the teacher the pictures and texts projected large on the wall; reading in small groups from poster-sized "big books" created by their parents and teachers; reading alone, while listening to stories on tape; illustrating stories and acting them out. It helps them learn early that reading can be fun. It also helps to bring together the young children from the various programs in the school, since everyone can use the literacy center.

This year, a group of Fitzgerald teachers, working voluntarily with a staff developer, have developed a unique writing curriculum that is about to be implemented in the school and could become the model for the entire system. The continued emphasis on helping students develop good writing skills is reflected in improved test scores.

In 1982, nearly half of a group of 39 third graders failed to pass the standardized writing test. When these same youngsters were tested in 1985, in sixth grade, more than 90% of them passed. The same progress is demonstrated by a similar group of 1985 eighth graders when we look at their sixth grade scores.

The goal of the Fitzgerald administration and staff is to promote the growth of each child by giving him/her assistance in acquiring the habits, the skills, the knowledge, the interests, the attitudes and the ideals that will serve him/her as an individual to live a happy, useful and satisfying life. Toward this end, they endeavor to provide learning experiences that will assist in the development of individual abilities, encourage the appreciation of self and others, strengthen the use of desirable ideals, habits and attitudes essential in every human relationship, and challenge each child to achieve his/her potential.

CHARLES G. HARRINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The Harrington School in Cambridge opened in 1960, and is currently in the first year of a major three year renovation to update the physical plant, during which some of their classes are housed in the nearby Kennedy School building. Five years ago, prior to desegregation, the school was only 4% minority. An ever-increasing majority of its students were either in the Portuguese TBE program or were "graduates" of that program. As of February, 1986, its students are 60% White, 23% Black, 3% Asian and 14% Hispanic, a total of 40% minority. Ten different languages are spoken in their homes. Forty-six percent of the students are from working-class families.

There are those who claim that Frances ("Fran") X. Foley, who has been the principal since 1977, wears invisible rollerskates and has a built-in recorder for names. Despite the fact that his school has the largest elementary population in the system -- 621 students, counting the three sixth grade classes in temporary exile at the Kennedy School during the renovation process -- he seems to be everwhere at once, and knows most students and their parents by name.

Affirmative action efforts in hiring new staff are designed to try to match the diversity in the student body, providing role models for all the students. The most recent appointment was that of Marguerita Ortiz-Alvarez to be assistant principal. The current faculty, staff and administration include 2 minority and 19 white males; 7 minority and 74 white females.

For many Harrington students and their parents, the most important person in the school is not the principal, nor the assistant principal, nor even their classroom teacher. It is their beloved head custodian who, if you listen to the children, is both all-knowing and all-seeing. He has been with the school since it opened, when the school staff and student body was pretty solidly white and the neighborhood was perceived as one to be avoided by people who were not white. Yet, it is doubtful that most

people, even then, paid much attention to the fact that Mr. Haywood is black. What is important is that he is an integral part of the Harrington "family."

The Harrington seems to have accomplished an ideal situation under desegregation. It has maintained the feel and flavor of a neighborhood school while undergoing greater ethnic change than perhaps any other school in the system. It has, in a sense, simply enlarged its neighborhood to encompass its new "neighbors." For example, many of its newer Haitian and Hispanic and other children come from families that depend on the same extended family structures as do the older Portuguese and Italian families. Daily, the front lobby fills up, just before school closes, with aunts and grandparents from all these groups -- often both grandparents together -- who come to pick up the children because the parents are at work.

The Harrington offers a variety of programs to serve the varied needs of its students. At the kindergarten level, parents may choose either a half or a full day program. Given the large number of working parents, it is not surprising that almost all select the full day option.

There are two programs for limited English proficient students: a TBE program serving students mostly from Portugal and the Azores -- the system's largest bilingual program; and an ESL center that provides individualized tutorial services for mainstreamed LEP students for whose languages we do not have a TBE program.

The Harrington is one of six target areas eligible for Chapter I support. This federal program funds Project D.I.R.E. (Development in Reading Efficiency), which provides individualized remedial tutorial services for students with reading deficiencies.

The Harrington is also one of three sites offering a Follow Through Program. This program was initiated by the federal government in 1967 to continue through grade three the advantages for low income children offered by Headstart.

Basic skill development in language arts has been a priority for the past several years. The city's second Literacy Center was instituted at the Harrington by a volunteer group of early childhood teachers and parents who worked over the summer with consultant Donald Holdaway. Holdaway came to Cambridge as a consultant in 1983 to help teachers learn the natural reading approach he and his colleagues developed in New Zealand teaching reading to migrant Polynesian and Maori students in the same classes with English speaking children.

All K-3 classes at the Harrington, including special needs and bilingual students, participate enthuiastically in the Literacy Center activities, discovering that reading and writing can be fun. It is fascinating to visit the literacy center and observe the youngsters -- speaking English with a variety of accents -- reading aloud in unision, and all of them using a New Zealand accent! (Example: "alligaTOR.") The Center also provides a common experience that helps improve realtionships among programs. Grade four to six teachers build on this foundation, using the Quill program through which students use the computer to develop creative writing skills.

The Special Needs staff serves 104 students with a variety of learning difficulties. These support services allow the students to continue to be part of the mainstream of the school.

A cooperative program with the nearby Museum of Science provides enrichment to classroom work in science, and is popular with parents and students, as well as teachers.

Physical education offerings include not only a swimming program but also the popular UMPA (Urban Modification of Project Adventure), designed to help students develop mutual trust and cooperation.

The Community Schools program (operated by the Department of Human Services) at the Harrington is one of the best in the city. It has programs for the elderly, a summer pre-school, an extensive sports program, after-school care, and a homework helper program, among others.

The school building is used almost every day of the year. The Just-a-Start non-profit community program trains young people in construction skills while renovating homes for low income families and undertaking beautification projects for the city. Americanization and English language courses for adults help newcomers with survival skills. The Cambridge Organization of Portuguese Americans (COPA) operates a summer day camp. And, every Sunday morning, nearby St. Anthony's Church holds CCD classes for some 800 children who couldn't possibly be accomodated even in the church's new building.

Much of the success of the Harrington is the result of a philosophy of equal and open access to all programs, courses of study and activities. All students, by their second day in the school, are made aware of the school

rules, applicable to all in a consistent manner. Multicultural education is continues throughout the year, geared to helping students know the positive contributions of individuals and cultures; and develop a respect for and sensitivity to diverse groups. Teaching styles vary from the traditional to open class setting, with an emphasis always on basic skill development and improving the self-esteem of the individual student.

Parent participation is encouraged and appreciated, as is evidenced by the regular presence of parents in the school and the many shared parent/school activities. Because the Harrington is our largest elementary school, and because of the large number of Portuguese speaking families, the Office of Desegregation has assigned two part-time Parent Liaisons, one of whom speaks Portuguese. They, as well as an administrator, are available for consultation with individual parents. The P.T.O. has initiated activities to involve all segments of the parent population.

A number of parents and grandparents volunteer in the school in various roles: they work in the Literacy Center, help with computer operations, assist on educational field trips and offer instructional support to the middle grades.

The leadership of the Harrington has worked hard to create a climate in which there is a positive reinforcement of the learning situation and in which all students feel that they are important and have something to contribute to the educational process. Staff development and inservice training have led to improved working relationships between the bilingual and mainstream staff; an increased sensitivity toward the varied ethnic groups represented in the school; and greater participation of the teachers in various activities such as membership, with parents, on the advisory, curriculum and continuum committees. All educational decisions are made with full teacher involvement.

During the five-year desgregation process, the increase in minority student population has been accompanied by a positive feeling between staff and students, open interaction among parents, teachers and administrators so that all feel part of the Harrington community. Ongoing efforts to maintain high standards of classroom atmosphere and management result in a higher quality of education in a setting that allows for individual differences among students and that respects their accomplishments.

For the past two years, with the assistance of the system-wide language arts coordinator and a staff developer

working with individual teachers, the Harrington has been striving to improve the teaching of writing. The results of that effort are clear. In 1983, in the then sixth grade, 52.1% of the students scored passing grades in writing. In 1985, 94.4% of the eighth grade passed the writing test.

Academic growth remains the number one goal for the school, with a primary focus on improvement in basic skills development -- especially in the area of language arts -- and an emphasis on positive attitudes and increased expectations for both staff and students.

HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The Longfellow School in Cambridge was built in 1929. At that time it was one of the most up-to-date elementary schools in the Boston area, being the first fireproof school building in the area. Times and needs change, so the Longfellow underwent a major renovation during the 1982 school year, re-opening in September of 1983 with a computer room, library, science laboratory and community rooms.

The administration, faculty and staff of the Longfellow include ten men and 58 women: 4 Black, 2 Asian, 9 Hispanic and 53 White. Its 470 students are 53% White, 11% Black, 6% Asian, and 31% Hispanic. Forty-seven percent of them come from all over the city, from areas outside the immediate neighborhood of the school. Forty-six percent of the students are low-income.

Upon entering the Longfellow, a visitor is immediately aware that all signs and notices in the building are in English, Spanish and Chinese. The school has even developed a trilingual calendar. Two TBE programs are housed at the Longfellow, the Hispanic and Chinese classes. Seeing their own languages throughout the building serves a dual purpose for the limited-English student. Not only does it help them in word-recognition, it also helps give them a sense of pride that their tongue is recognized, as well as English, by the school as a whole. At the same time, children whose only language is English tend to pick up a smattering of the words familiar to their non-English schoolmates.

ESL lessons are offered for parents; translators are in attendance at PTA meetings; there is frequent communication between school and home. A major cultural event for the current academic year will be the Immigrants' Play. Students born in the United States are interviewing their foreign-born peers and writing a play about them, which they will perform for the entire school and parents. This is an outgrowth of the on-going Oral History project, which involves soliciting and recording the personal and cultural histories of many diverse members of the community.

The Longfellow staff and admnistrator are constantly working to make the process of transition easier for the bilingual student who is ready to move from the TBE program to a mainstream class. The bilingual teacher and mainstream teacher act as a transition team to ensure that the change is as smooth as possible for the student.

A variety of teaching and learning styles are used in the school, from whole group to small group and individual instruction. The teachers and administration are constantly examining new methods, programs and materials, in order to provide the best possible education for the students. Margaret Carroll, now in her eighth year as principal, deserves credit for creating an atmosphere within which teachers can feel free to be flexible in order to meet the needs of the students; for bringing into the school new creative program ideas and, above all, for her unquestioned attitude of caring for children.

The current Parent Liaison remembers that, when she attended the Longfellow, long before there was any thought of formal school desegregation, the Longfellow, by virtue of its location, had a more diverse population than most schools in the system. She remembers the fifth grade teacher she had, who has also taught her daughter, and who is able to "generate a group feeling and mutual respect among students in the classroom."

The Longfellow School is the site of the city's first Literacy Center, founded with the help of Donald Holdaway, a New Zealander who, with his colleagues, developed a natural approach to teaching reading that inspires enthusiasm in parents, teachers and especially students. All kindergarten through third grade classes participate in the Center, which is under the direction of a Language Resource Specialist. Parents are also encouraged to participate, and many help make learning materials. A favorite parent activity is creating "big books" -- poster size versions of picture books and readers that groups of children may use together.

The school-wide emphasis on language arts is beginning to bear fruit. In 1983, 90.9% of the sixth grade students passed the reading test, and 82.3% passed writing. In 1985, in eighth grade, 94.2% passed reading and 95.6% passed writing.

The Longfellow is also the home of the system's Intensive Studies Program (ISP). This is an academically advanced program offering able 6th, 7th and 8th grade students from across the city a more intensive educational

experience. Its goals are to: provide a challenging academic curriculum; develop student responsibility, initiative and decision-making; encourage students to pursue individual interests. Each year, able students are invited to request placement. A particular effort is made to make the program truly representative, including recruiting not only minority students but also those with a TBE or ESL background.

Physical education is enriched with the UMPA (Urban Modification of Project Adventure) program, providing students with activities that encourage and foster mutual trust and cooperation. Chapter I and Special Needs services are available for all students needing them.

Other special features of the Longfellow include an Artist- in-Residence; volunteer tutors from Leverett House, Harvard University; the Big Brother/Big Sister program; Black Achievers Program; Foster Grandparents; peer and cross-age tutoring; a cooperative program with the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard; and Project Business.

When the students, in grades 7 and 8, embark on a departmentalized instructional program, there is a tendency to lose some of the heterogeneity of the earlier years. The Longfellow counters this by ensuring that all students are assigned to integrated home rooms, and that they come together for art, music and physical education classes.

An exciting innovation at this level are the Wednesday afternoon mini-courses, developed as a result of student/teacher initiative. Students have a wide range of choices, some of which involve not just students but also their families. Students make their choices based on their own interests. The options available range from classes in video-making, the French language, quilt-making and photography to coed volleyball and seminars on family violence. Some opt for such community service activities as tutoring, making "big books" for the Literacy Center, and office work. Still others join the Mentor Program, working with artists, the Loeb Drama Center at Harvard, and local businesses (the ice-cream business is especially popular!).

The Longfellow Community School, operated under the auspices of the city's Department of Human Services, offers a wide range of activities for students and area residents. The program offerings are developed by the Longfellow Neighborhood Council; with activities being housed in the Longfellow and other area facilities. They include a preschool for young children, after-school care for children in grades 1-4, special interest programs for all elementary students, adult education classes, family day and week-end

trips. Human Services also operates a Teen Center, with a program based on the University of North Carolina Early Adolescents' Program, three nights a week.

The Longfellow has a very active PTA. Parents serve on committees helping make educational and program decisions, volunteer to work in the Literacy Center, art and music programs and academic classrooms. They raise money while improving school spirit with the sales of Longfellow T-shirts and sweatshirts. Last year, the PTA awarded $100 mini-grants to the Computer Lab, the school library, the Art, Music and Physical Education programs.

Parents are greatly involved in the classrooms. At the kindergarten level, parents often help in one-to-one tutoring of students needing help learning the alphabet or developing other pre-reading skills. In the upper grades, parents often come in to share their own job experiences and/or cultural backgrounds with the students. In one class, a father brought artifacts and a film to spark the discussion of his Korean background and culture.

The leadership of the school, teachers and administration, are committed to working with students of all ability levels and from all backgrounds, and to maintaining a positive climate within which this is possible. Expectations are high for all students. Staff development opportunities and some team teaching allow teachers to share experiences and keep up-to-date on new methods and ideas in their field.

Says a veteran teacher: "The three things that make the Longfellow School a stimulating place to work are (1) the students, (2) the faculty and (3) the admnistration. When you combine a multi-ethnic/multi-cultural student body and a conscientious faculty which has diverse talents with an administrator who provides the support which is essential to creative classroom and extra-curricular activities -- THAT'S EXCITING!"

Holyoke

The Holyoke School System, with over 40% minority enrollment, developed and implemented a very sound desegregation plan with broad-based community support. Holyoke is the only Massachusetts system, aside from Boston, which has done so with the involvement of a Federal District Court as well as of the Department of Education.

Our involvement began in October 1977, in response to a request for advice from George Counter about the legal impact of proposed movement of elementary students which would have the effect of further isolating Hispanic students. We explained the dangers of such a course, and offered assistance in developing a sound approach to student assignments. Such planning did not really begin until early 1980, when the prospective closing of one of the schools in the Hispanic section of Holyoke forced a decision about placement of students.

Over the subsequent months we worked with the system to develop a plan which reassigned the fifth and sixth grades to two predominantly white schools, while accommodating the lower grades in a new Morgan School facility next door to the old school. This was seen as a temporary solution, however, and we continued to work with Counter--who became Acting Superintendent and then Superintendent--to come up with a stable long-term plan.

Meanwhile, the Hispanic Parents Advisory Council brought a class action suit in Federal District Court charging violations of the constitutional rights of minority students. Our role became one of seeking to mediate a remedy which would satisfy the concerns of these parents, which would be considered positive by Holyoke school officials, and which would satisfy all legal requirements.

The keystone of this remedy was agreement to a plan that included the following elements:

stability
educational soundness
strenghtening of bilingual education
fiscal responsibility
equity of burden and benefits
safety and security
increased voluntary options
no more transportation than necessary
effective desegregation

Once these criteria were generally accepted it became a matter of reacting to options developed by the school department, with suggestions from the Hispanic parents and the state, in terms of criteria which we all accepted.

After acceptable options had been negotiated, Superintendent Counter began a series of community meetings to obtain reactions and modify the options. His objective was to involve all parts of the community and to build a consensus for the plan before it was in final shape, rather than to have to "sell" a plan which was already adopted. We met with the School Committee and attended public hearings as needed, to explain the considerations which we would use in our review and to provide information about successful desegregation--and problems--in other cities.

The School Committee adopted a plan in May 1981, and it was approved by the Board of Education in June and implemented in September, despite lack of full cooperation by the Mayor. In December 1981 Judge Frank Freedman--by coincidence the Mayor of Springfield when the Six District Plan was ordered in that community--approved a consent decree entered into by the Hispanic parents and the Holyoke city and school officials, retaining jurisdiction of the case. The consent decree required ongoing implementation of the plan which the Board had approved, regular reports on implementation, negotiation prior to modifications, and expenditure of additional funds as necessary to carry out the plan.

Under the leadership of Superintendent George Counter and his staff the system was able to use desegregation as a catalyst for initiating comprehensive education reform at the elementary level. Such schools as the Kelly, Morgan and Lawrence which even School Committee characterized as being "lousy" before desegregation, have now become effective urban schools. Instead of being seen as a stagnant and

second-rate system, Holyoke has now become a system where new programs in science, bilingual education, human relations and reading are commonplace.

Charles L. Glenn

CITY OF HOLYOKE

MASSACHUSETTS

ZIP CODE 01040 - 4488

GEORGE W. COUNTER
Superintendent

HOLYOKE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Suffolk Street
Tel. 413-534-2005

February 27, 1986

Dr. Charles Glenn, Director
Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
Massachusetts Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Dear Dr. Glenn:

As Superintendent, it is my pleasure to call to your attention three of our elementary schools as examples of successfully integrated urban schools. These schools are the Morgan, McMahon and Kelly Schools. As a direct result of the desegregation plan implemented in our school district five years ago, these schools have all seen the achievement of an integrated student body and improvement in school climate. Other results have been an improvement in academic performance for all students, the addition of a variety of enriched educational offerings and a substantial increase in the quality and amount of parent participation. Staff working in these schools have developed a new sense of mission and commitment to their work. School attendance for all students, especially for minority students, has improved in all of these schools. Measurement of the degree of student interaction in these schools through use of the Springfield Cross Racial Inventory also shows that we are meeting our goals of increased social interaction among majority and minority students in these schools.

A review of academic achievement test data for these schools shows that majority student scores have not been negatively impacted by desegregation and that minority student achievement scores have improved slightly. There still exists a disparity of achievement on standardized academic tests that correlates with ethnicity and economic background. As you know, one of our most important goals for the coming years is to further close the performance gap between majority and minority students as measured by standardized achievement tests.

The variety of enriched program offerings that we have been able to put in place in these schools since desegregation is truly impressive.

The offerings include magnet programs in reading, language arts, two way bilingual education and Spanish as a second language; computer literacy programs, a cooperative program for environmental studies in collaboration with the Hitchcock Center in Amherst, a folk heritage project in music and the arts, after school day care for the children of working parents, and team taught kindergartens. We are proud of our accomplishments in these areas and are well aware that most of these programs would not exist had we not integrated our school system five years ago.

I would be happy to provide you with data on student achievement in these schools and with any additional information on the various programs that I have mentioned.

Yours sincerely,

George Counter

George W. Counter
Superintendent of Schools

GWC:ek

DESEGREGATION DIRECTORS' REPORT

The Holyoke Public Schools Desegregation Support Project has, since its inception in 1981, provided a concentrated program of supportive services along with Magnet instructional services.

The positive impact of the Magnet Instructional Component is evident in the highlighting of three of our successful Magnet Programs in the acompanying school profiles.

The support service has been in the form of a Teacher Support Team, a group of specially trained, experienced teachers who are able to lend support to administration, staff, and parents on a full time basis.

The initial focus of the Teacher Support Team involved staff development efforts for all elementary staff members. This included the provisions for 5 - 10 days of full time inservice training for every elementary administrator, teacher, and support staff member(custodians, clerk, etc.) in all equity related areas.

The evolution of the Teacher Support Team has incorporated the specialization of the staff into specific areas rather than general integration support. At present, the Teacher Support Team includes specialists working in the areas of Parent Involvement, Drop-out Prevention, Staff and Curriculum Development modeled on Ron Edmonds Effective School Model, Community and Public Relations, Early Childhood Data Collection and Analysis, and Secondary English and Social Studies Staff and Curriculum Development.

The evolution has also incorporated the change in the Teacher Support Team from an all elementary trained unit to a group now consisting of elementary and secondary staff as well as experienced community service providers. The Teacher Support Team is now better able to meet the needs of our entire educational unit K-12, as well as parent and community interests.

Some of the results of this specialization include a documented Effective Schools Math Project in grades 3 & 4, the development of a more active central parent group, the collection and reporting of significant data on achievement, and drop outs, the development and dissemination of staff and parent newsletters and bulletins, the development of a long-term student enrollment projection, and the continued inservice training of secondary English and Social Studies staff.

The success of the Teacher Support Team is evident in the incorporation of staff and staff developed information in a series of longterm district planning efforts. As noted by the Superintendent, the Holyoke Public Schools has identified the need for long-term plans aimed at addressing such issues as the underachievement of minority students, the high dropout and suspension rates, the lack of minority participation at secondary level academic and co-curricular activities and the lack of strong representative parent participation.

The unique design of the Holyoke Desegregation Support Unit, involving both direct instructional Magnet Programs and a Teacher Support Team, along with continued administrative and School Committee support has enabled our desegregation effort to move into the "mainstream" of the Holyoke Public Schools. Desegregation is not an add-on in our schools, but a contributing, participating and in some instances, a designer of district plans. This participation, to date, has provided realistic needs assessment as well as ensuring that future programmatic action and development will reflect the needs of all our students.

KELLY SCHOOL

Kelly School is a grade 4-6 school. It provides neighborhood kindergarten services and has a student population totaling 581. The racial distribution is 59% Hispanic, 36% White, 4% Black, and 1% Asian. It is situated in a downtown predominantly Puerto Rican neighborhood, yet it has a non-Hispanic population drawn from some of the most affluent Holyoke neighborhoods. One of the primary reasons for the maintenance of a balanced student population is the Chapter 636 Magnet Reading Program which offers a High Intensity Reading opportunity to all Kelly students.

It is the pride of the staff, from the principal's office to the cooks in the kitchen, that all of the students at Kelly understand the underlying goal of their activities - namely to attempt to master the basis academic skills of computation and literacy. The staff works very hard first of all to students, parents, and even occasional visitors to convey the idea that learning occurs best in an orderly environment. Rules of conduct are emphasized not for their inherent worth but as a means to achieving a productive teaching/learning environment. They are applied by teachers and administrators fairly to all students but are tempered with an eye to each individual situation. Negative sanctions become necessary only on rare occasions. Special movie presentations on a regular basis are used to reward both behavioral and academic efforts and success. Sixth grade students have looked forward to their traditional picnic and alpine/water slide outing, which marks the successful completion of their career at Kelly. An annual awards day also recognises the achievement of the students in the presence of their parents.

The academic program itself is shaped by the attempt to deliver instruction as closely as possible to the individual needs of the learner. To accomplish this both the reading and math instruction involves grouping within grade levels. Groupings are, however, flexible enough to allow for changes as individual students progress beyond or fall behind group learning. Changes of this nature are based on teachers'observations, as well as informal and formal assessments.

Kelly School was the first Holyoke school to employ the Two-Way Bilingual model. The class pairings of the Two-Way Program encourage daily interaction among monolingual and T.B.E. Program students. The progress of students whose dominant language is Spanish is carefully monitored to insure the appropriate language of instruction as well as the appropriate timing for the mainstreaming to begin, proceed, and be completed. Cooperation between the Bilingual staff and monolingual staff is excellent throughout the mainstreaming process. These ties are assisted by class pairings developed under the Two-way Bilingual Program.

Kelly also boasts of exemplary supportive programs including Chapter I, Chapter 636, Spanish As a Second Language, Computer Education, and Moderate Special Needs Resource Services. The school has been able to provide for a continuum of supportive reading services ranging from Chapter I Remediation to Chapter 636 Enrichment for high achieving readers. Working closely together in an individualized reading lab, these two programs exemplify the high level of cooperation among the staff to achieve maximum student learning. It is not uncommon for students entering fourth grade in need of Chapter I services to progress to grade level and participate in the Magnet Enrichment Program before leaving to seventh grade.

Chapter 636 staff also act as curriculum resources for classroom teachers in the area of multicultural education. Special Magnet staff has recently given emphasis to improving the school library by providing special story hours to students and coordinating book acquisition with the classroom teachers. It is hoped that these activities will enhance an already strong reading program. Computer education is available to all students in grades 4-6. Students learn computer use through Logo and utilize software programs that assist in practicing other academics subjects. Native English speakers are given the opportunity to begin to learn the language of their bilingual peers in the Spanish as a Second Language Program. This can be a first step toward mutual understanding and toward the destruction of ethnic stereotyping.

Another unique part of the Kelly School is the presence of one hundred Special Education Program students who participate in the model Project Rise program. The incorporation of these exceptional students in the daily life of an intermediate level urban school constributes special significance to our feeling that the Kelly School offers one of the most diverse student populations in

Massachusetts at this educational level.

As measured by Grade 5 California Achievement Test results, Kelly School has increased its achievement in each year since desegregation with a total battery Normal Curve Equivalent score of 48.1 in 1982, 51.3 in 1983 and 53.7 in 1984. In a 1985 analysis of Kelly data according to the Effective Schools base of the 40th percentile, 46% of Hispanic 6th graders in monolingual English classes and 59% of Hispanic 5th graders achieved above the 40th percentile. This achievement compares very favorably to Hispanic mainstream district averages of 39% at the 6th grade level and 49% at the 5th grade level. The improved achievement of Hispanics and non-Hispanics at Kelly also compares very favorably to district averages. The district differences in achievement in percentile scores at the 6th grade is 29 percentile points, while Kelly's differential is 24. At the 5th grade level, the district differential is 26 percentile points while Kelly's differential is 18.

In the first application of the Springfield Cross Racial Selection Inventory in January 1985, Kelly School fourth grade students chose at a very positive selection rate of .815, with students choosing an actual rate of 225 as against an expected rate of 276.

Academic success through individual effort and mutual respect is the reason that the Kelly School community; professional and non-professional staff, parents, and students are proud of their achievements. Visitors as diverse as Governor Dukakis and Storyteller Judith Black; basketball player M. L. Carr, and Grandma Nellie, have sensed this pride in the courtesy with which they are greeted, the attention they are accorded, and the ease with which these occur. Kelly School is truly an effective learning community. We at Kelly School recognize the issues to be dealt with in quality and equitable urban education. We look forward to meeting the challenges that we face.

MCMAHON SCHOOL

The McMahon School is an elementary school serving kindergarten through third grade students. At the beginning of desegregation in 1981 McMahon School had 363 students, 15% of whom were Hispanic. A voluntary Language Enrichment Magnet Program was introduced in 1981. A Two-way Bilingual and an Extended Day Magnet Program were added in 1984. As a direct result of these three programs, the Hispanic population grew to 21% in 1983, 29% in 1984 and 45% in 1985. The primary purpose of Magnet programs, to increase racial balance, has been clearly served at the McMahon School. Beyond the primary goal of desegregation, the following data is offered to demonstrate the further success McMahon has achieved toward full integration.

McMahon student achievement, as measured by 3rd grade performance on the California Achievement Test in total reading indicates that the significant change in the student population has not had a negative impact on student achievement. CAT scores showed a mean at the 55th percentile in 1982, 55th percentile in 1983, 50th in 1984, and 62nd in 1985.

In data analysis using the Effective School base of the 40th percentile, 71% of the Hispanic students in monolingual English classes achieved above the 40th percentile as compared to 84% of the non-Hispanics classmates, a 13% differential. This compares very favorably to the district differential of 25%.

This data is further supported in the 1985 final Chapter 636 report. As reported by the evaluator, most children in the intensive English component at the McMahon school showed gains in English language proficiency with grades K, 2 and 3 achieving pre-set performance standards on language sub-tests of the California Achievement Test.

According to the Springfield Cross Racial Selection Inventory, administered in January 1985, McMahon 3rd graders in monolingual English classrooms achieved at 1.05 rate, exceeding what has been termed "total integration".

The Springfield Cross Racial Selection Inventory was not administered to the TBE Magnet students because consistent translation and administration was not available, nor was there a cross-racial audience. Concerning achievement testing, McMahon School TBE students achieved at a Normal Curve Equivalent of 26 on May 1985 California Test of Basic Skills testing. This was not only below average, but also below other 3rd grade TBE scores district wide. The complex reasons for this disparity are under examination.

One outgrowth of the Two-Way Bilingual Program is the voluntary participation of one hundred thirteen White English speaking students. A likely reason for the high cross-racial selection score (1.05) is the continued daily multicultural effort on the part of staff. Students in the Two-Way Program at McMahon, in addition to receiving Spanish language instruction, interact with bilingual students on a daily basis. Multicultural lessons are taught in all classrooms by the Chapter 636 staff, schoolwide integrated activities are ongoing. While we recognize the need for the improved academic achievement of our TBE students, we are very encouraged by the initial achievements of our integration efforts.

To greater enhance the interaction between all of the McMahon students, the Magnet staff sponsors projects that include the entire faculty and student body. One such activity this year involved teaching a unit on sexism in occupations, based on the book "Sam Johnson And The Blue Ribbon Quilt." The entire school created an art work quilt. It was displayed on the wall in the main hall and generated much enthusiasm as the children proudly identified their quilt blocks and those of their teachers. Another planned activity to promote positive interaction across language, culture, and economic groups is the cultivation of a school garden. Each student and faculty member will participate.

The McMahon School Holiday Bazaar has become an annual school/family affair. All of the students, under the direction of their classroom teachers, worked together to make craft items that were sold at the Bazaar. Groups of parents and teachers met bi-monthly to work on the more complicated craft items. These meetings were beneficial to both parents and teachers. They gave each one an opportunity to work together in the interests of a common goal - their children. On the night of the Bazaar, the booths were staffed by teachers and parents, while older students helped to set up and display the crafts. Bazaar Night this year was both a financial and social success.

Students, parents, and teachers were able to meet and work together informally, promoting communication and understanding.

In December, Dr. William Van Voris, Professor of English and Irish literature at Smith College came to our school. He spoke about "The Journey of St. Nicholas," presenting a wide spectrum of holiday customs, practices, legends, and myths. Ethnic groups included Greeks, Serbians, Russians, Laplanders, Spanish, Italians, Dutch, and English. The children at McMahon were exposed to the many similarities and differences of these ethnic groups and the universality of mankind.

Another December project was a play performed by two second grade cluster classrooms. In the process of producing the play, the children learned a great deal about the importance of hard work and cooperation. The presentation concluded with a bilingual song fest. The Afro-American celebration of Kwanza was yet another December activity engaging McMahon students and teachers. A dance and and dramatic performance by local Black artists Patti O'Neill and Rick Scott Gordon was the culminating activity for this multicultural study.

In February the four 3rd grade cluster classrooms presented the play "The Sneeches". The play was adapted bilingually from the book by Dr. Seuss. Mr. Eshu Bumpus, a multicultural dramatic arts specialist was director and was able to elicit much talent and enthusiasm from the children. Eighty-six children participated. The cooperation and positive interaction was evident in the final dramatization and in the warm reception by parents and all others attending.

The Magnet staff at McMahon has also instituted a series of workshops to increase parent involvement and promote dialoque between parents from different racial, linguistic, and economic backgrounds. Three workshops have already taken place, with an increase in attendance at each one. More sessions are slated for the Spring. Issues and concerns raised by parents in these forums have been forwarded to our City-Wide Parent Planning Council. We are extremely pleased with the level of interest and involvement these efforts have engendered.

McMahon School is to be commended for the successes of its voluntary efforts and achievements toward integration. Direct attention must now be focused on eliminating the disparity in academic achievement between Hispanic and non-Hispanic students through further support from educational equity resources.

MORGAN SCHOOL

Morgan School is a K-3 school. It houses 309 students, 62% of whom are Hispanic. For the last five years it has been a Chapter 636 Magnet School offering extended day and language enrichment Magnet services. It has attempted to voluntarily enroll White English speaking students. The White English speaking Magnet population of the Morgan School has risen from 64 in 1983, to 91 in 1984 to 105 in 1985. There is presently a waiting list for admission to the Magnet due to limited space availability. The success of the Magnet program has contributed to a marked decrease in Hispanic isolation. The Hispanic population percentage has gone from 73% in 1983 to 62% in 1985. At the same time, the White English speaking population now constitutes 34% of the population as compared to 24% in 1983. The White English speaking population was 17% at the onset of desegregation in 1981.

Over the last four years, the 3rd grade achievement test results, as indicated by total reading performances on the California Achievement Test, have risen from a 39.7 Normal Curve Equivalent in 1982, to 43.0 in 1983 to 45.6 in 1984 to 48.9 in 1985.

In an effort to provide more insight in the area of achievement testing, data was analyzed according to the Effective Schools research using the 40th percentile as a base. Comparing Hispanic and non-Hispanic achievement according to that formula, 53% of Hispanic 3rd graders scored above the 40th percentile while 64% of the non-Hispanic students achieved above the 40th percentile. This differential between Hispanic and non-Hispanic achievement was only 11 percentile points as compared to a district differential of 25 at the 3rd grade level. As compared to total district, 57% of Morgan 3rd grade monolingual English classroom students scored above the 40th percentile as compared to a district average of 66%.

1985 was the first year that the Holyoke Public Schools administered the Springfield Cross Racial Selection Inventory. Morgan School 3rd graders achieved a .947 selection, actual vs expected selection rate, indicating that a very positive integration atmosphere exists in the school.

Specific to the Magnet population, according to the final Chapter 636 evaluation in July 1985, the student performance in all cases far exceeded the performance standard and where sample sizes exceed ten cases, they were statistically significant.

Literature becomes a living experience at Morgan School. Two Magnet programs have helped to enhance the academic performance of our students. Through individualized reading and multicultural reading enrichment student self-concept, expression, and confidence are reinforced along with word analysis and comprehension skills. Visits from noted authors, poets, and dramatists in the field of children's literature are among the highlights of our program and have helped to motivate students' own creative drama and puppetry productions. A before-school reading club, arts and crafts projects, gym, and hands-on science activities further extend the learning opportunities of our Magnet students.

In concert with the Magnet programs, the basic offerings at Morgan School are augmented by numerous additional activities. Each classroom makes weekly visits to the library. Fifteen minutes are set aside daily for independent silent reading. Teachers read aloud from quality children's literature selections for an additional fifteen minutes a day. To the benefit of both listeners and readers, second and third grade students also make regular visits to read aloud to small groups of kindergarten and first graders.

To further the concomitant goals of parent involvement and student success, Morgan School has instituted the use of "Parent Kits". At the beginning of each year, students bring home the Parent Kits, filled with reading vocabulary and spelling lists, math flash cards, games and activities for parents and children to work on together. Parents are encouraged to spend fifteen minutes each day using the kits, which have most enthusiastically received.

Whole-school activities are part of the spirit and distinctive personality of the Morgan School. We have a school chorus for third graders and a folk dance group for first and second graders. Each year, the groups combine their efforts in joint productions that are the pride of students, parents, and teachers alike. Last year's production included twenty folk songs and 15 folk dances and was one of the hands-down favorites of the school system's annual Patchwork Multicultural Fair. Excitement and anticipation are already building for this year's theme--

music and dance from the 40's and 50's. Magnet and neighborhood students participate side by side in these endeavors, with parents and teachers contributing 110%.

The Morgan School is to be highlighted as a true Magnet School. It remains situated in a downtown predominantly Hispanic urban setting, yet in five short years has attracted and retained students from all sections of Holyoke. The data should not suggest that there is not need for significant educational improvement. Test scores do not reflect the city average nor do a majority of the students achieve at an above average rate. But these scores do indicate academic achievement and growth, along with positive integration. Also, the waiting lists indicate positive parental acceptance and support. We at Morgan School are proud of our efforts and the efforts of Chapter 636 in achieving a voluntarily integrated learning environment.

Lowell

On April 8, 1981 the Lowell School Committee voluntarily adopted a plan to reduce and eliminate minority isolation through the use of "thematic" magnet schools in Grades K-8. Under this plan, which was approved by the State Board of Education in May 1981 and reaffirmed by the School Committee in February 1983, Lowell officials created two new K-8 magnets, and developed four additional thematic magnets to reduce minority isolation at the Green School.

So-called thematic magnet schools aim at facilitating voluntary desegregation by offering parents and students educational options that are not readily available in other schools within the system. The thematic approach to magnet schooling is based upon the belief that parents have varied and distinct educational interests and that the actual process of teaching and learning in any school is inherently differential. Not all teachers and students teach and learn alike. Advocates of distinctive magnet schools argue that variation and educational diversity are indeed positive attributes of urban schools and, if used properly, can lead to increased equal educational opportunities for all students.

An important feature of Lowell's magnet schools is that they are grounded in what parents have actually identified as being educationally attractive. With funding assistance provided by Chapter 636, Lowell school officials and members of the Citywide Parents Planning Council conducted in-depth parent-interest surveys in each of the system's 26 elementary and intermediate schools prior to the adoption of the Lowell Plan. The purpose of the surveys, carried out in 1980 and 1981, was to determine the extent of parental satisfaction with the Lowell Public Schools, and on the

basis of this information, identify particular educational options that might be attrtactive to parents and thereby facilitate voluntary school desegregation.

The surveys showed that while over 85% of the parents were "satisfied" with their child's education, 84.6% indicated that they "would like to be able to choose the educational program" best suited for their child. Consequently, parents were asked to identify their educational preferences within a range of educational options that could be developed into thematic magnet schools.

Charles L. Glenn

LOWELL MAGNET NETWORK PROGRESS REPORT - SCHOOL YEAR 1985-86

by George N. Tsapatsaris, Project Director
Lowell Public Schools

During the 1985-1986 school year, the Lowell School Department has continued to implement its long range voluntary desegregation plan. This plan calls for the reduction of minority isolation by the voluntary movement of students, both majority and minority, to magnet schools. Lowell, since 1979-1980, has developed two citywide (K-8) magnet schools and five district (K-8, K-3, K-5 and K-4) magnet schools.

These seven thematic magnet schools are at different levels and stages of development. The Rogers Fundamental Magnet School has been in operation since 1979 and has successfully recruited over 100 majority students each year to the present. During the 1984-1985 school year, it was recognized as 1 of 25 effective desegregated schools in Massachusetts by the State Board of Education.

The two citywide magnet schools--the Arts and City--have been in operation since September 1981, and are 100% voluntary magnet schools. In each of these citywide magnet schools, 60% of the seats are made available for majority volunteer students and 40% of the seats are made available for minority volunteer students. Each school has been developing its unique and different curriculum; the Arts School, through the Fine, Applied and Performing Arts and the City School through its micro-society, economy, government and publishing strands.

During the 1984-1985 school year, the City School was recognized as 1 of 25 effective desegregated schools in Massachusetts by the State Board of Education.

The year 1986 marks a milestone for both of these schools in that for the 1986-1987 school year we will see both schools housed in newly renovated buildings located in the heart of the National Park District. These newly renovated buildings were formerly trade school buildings. Lowell was most fortunate to receive 90% renovation funds from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to make these exciting

renovations to the specifications of the unique and different curriculum of each school.

Staff, parents and students have had an integral imput in the development of the plans for each school. Phase I, which will house the entire Arts school on Paige Street and part of the City School on French Street will be completed on or about August 1, 1986. Phase II, which is the remainder of the City School on French Street, will be completed by January 1987. It is anticipated that a total voluntary student population of 337 for each school will be in place by September , 1987. This will represent almost a 100% increase in enrollment in these two schools.

The Bartlett, Green, Greenhalge and Lincoln District Magnet Schools have been developing since 1982. Like the other three magnet schools (Arts, City, and Rogers), each of these schools recruit volunteer students citywide, but especially from the Green and Shaughnessy school districts which have a significant minority enrollment. In fact, the Green School has a 50 to 51% minority enrollment and the Shaughnessy is 41%.

The Bartlett School this year has received a substantial grant ($10,000) from the Theodore Edson Parker Foundation to provide services to their K-6 students from Creative Educational Associates (Edutainment). This will be part of three year thrust in behavioral modification for the K-8 student population of this school.

Lowell is most fortunate to have in each of these magnet schools a full time program facilitator who is responsible for:

1) staff development
2) program development
3) pupil progress, and
4) parent involvement

The full-time program facilitator provides that necessary element for the Principal and School to ensure a successful, exciting and productive program.

During the 1985-1986 school year, the Lowell School Department has received additional Chapter 636 funds to assist the Bilingual Department at the High School level for support services to the significant number of Camodian bilingual students. These services attend to the social, psychological and educational adjustments that are required to bridge the transition that is necessary for these

students. We are most fortunate to have the services of MICA (Metropolitan Indochinese Children and adolescent Services) in this endeavor.

In addition, during the 1985/1986 school year, the Lowell School Department has received Chapter 636 funds to develop an extended school day program for Camodian Bilingual students and majority students from a nearby Parochial School. The extended day will concentrate on Cultural exchange between the two populations. It is anticipated that this will be in full swing by March of this year.

OUTLOOK FOR 1987-1988

The minority enrollment in Lowell continues to grow. Presently, the School system minority percentage is at 27% and is expected to reach 30% by 1988.

The Magnet Schools continue to develop and with the opening of the new facilities for the Arts and City Magnet schools in 1986, a major compnent of the Magnet School Network will be in place.

The Headmaster at Lowell High School has indicated an interest in developing a magnet school in each of his four sub-schools (houses). The High School is presently at a 20% minority enrollment and increasing. Futhermore, the High School is beginning to receive many of the magnet school graduates and must prepare continuing programs for these students and other students who wish to participate in these programs.

THE ARTS MAGNET SCHOOL

The Arts Magnet School was created in 1981 as part of Lowell's voluntary desegregation plan. Presently located on the South Campus of the University of Lowell, the Arts School houses 146 kindergarten through 8th grade students. As a citywide magnet school, the Arts School attracts a diverse population of youngsters from various economic sections of the city of Lowell. Of the 146 students, 60% are majority and 40% are minority (including 17 Black--12%, 27 Hispanic--19%, 4 Asian--3%, and 9 American Indian--6%). Those students living in Chapter I target areas are eligible for on-site Chapter I services. Our Chapter I program is now servicing approximately 50 children.

The educational program at the Arts Magnet School is reflected in its curriculum; enhanced by special events, field trips, artists-in-residence; and supported by a dedicated staff and involved parent organization.

The curriculum includes the sequence of basic skills taught at each level, artistic courses of study offered to the students and effective lesson plans describing artistic methods employed to teach the basic skills. The intent of the curriculum is to provide a strong foundation in basic academic skills which will in turn support the creative artistic involvement of the students. Students at the Arts School are graded not only in basic skills but also in their specialized arts courses.

The Arts School provides countless educational and artistic opportunities to all children, such as: advanced art courses, the theatre company, chorus, instrumental lessons, photography, field trips, and artists-in-residence. Children are exposed to the arts not only in the school atmosphere, but also in the professional world. They have the opportunity to learn from professionals in various artistic fields, as well as view quality exhibits, concerts and performances. Self discipline, responsibility and self-confidence are qualities that our students are encouraged to exhibit. Each child learns and performs in an accepting, non-threatening atmosphere which allows the individual to develop confidence in his/her ability. We feel that in the arts there are no racial or cultural boundaries. One is limited only by his/her imagination or refusal to participate.

Artistic events are prevalent at the Arts Magnet School. Our program enjoys the services of many artists-in-residence covering the fields of music, art, dance, photography and theatre. For example, our students have visited the Museum of Fine Arts and the China Exhibit, as well as attended performances by the Merrimack Repertory Theatre, Wheelock Family Theatre, Boston Symphony, Boston Ballet, and Theatre for Children.

A very special component of our artists-in-residence program is an academic/artistic collaboration between the Arts Magnet School and the Merrimack Repertory Theatre. For the past three years, students at the Arts School have participated in the MRT's production of A CHRISTMAS CAROL. The children have had the opportunity to work alongside professional actors and technicians.

Parents and community volunteers are very important to the unique program at the Arts School. Parents of all students are encouraged to visit the school, attend PTO meetings and assist in the daily activities of the school. Some of the areas in which parents have participated are: fund raising, curriculum planning, publishing a newsletter, and assisting with the kindergarten classes. Students from the University of Lowell have assisted us with our musical performances by composing original scores, the school song and accompanying our students. Currently, we have University students assisting in the art, music and kindergarten classes.

The success of the program at the Arts Magnet School can be attributed to the commitment and dedication of the faculty and students to their school and its philosophy. The Arts School is a reflection of the talented staff and students participating in its daily activities. Our staff includes a professional artist, musician/composer, photographer, and theatre instructor.

Our students' art work has been exhibited in many locations throughout the city. Various groups have commissioned the students' graphic creations for posters, invitations, logos, and playbills. Student photogaphs have been published in several local papers. Award-winning student photographs have received city, state and national recognition.

The students also have the opportunity to participate in the performing arts. Instrumental and vocal choral lessons are given to the students. The children have written and performed an original musical comedy, FISHFACE. The faculty and students of the Arts School received an Official Citation from the Massachusetts State Senate commending them

for their outstanding performances. In addition to FISHFACE, the Rising Star Theatre Company of the Arts Magnet School performs various plays for school and public audiences in the Lowell area.

This year's production, KING DIDRICK'S WILL, is another original musical comedy written by the eighth graders, their English teacher and a University of Lowell student. This year's performance is very special because the producing director of the Merrimack Repertory Theatre is playing the title role. His performance is a result of the continued collaboration between the academic and professional world.

The Arts Magnet School offers students of Lowell a very special choice--a choice that requires student commitment, self-discipline and interest. Academically, each student is expected to work to his/her full capacity. Artistically, each student is expected to contribute to the various programs of study offered through our curriculum. In turn, the faculty endeavors to assist and guide each student in developing his/her talent in at least one area of the arts to the highest possible standard. By encouraging the development of high artistic and academic standards, it is our hope that all students will thrive in an atmosphere that will be most conducive to a successful education through the arts. Carl Ayotte, composer of "Dedicated to the Arts" (our school song), sums up the Arts School Philosophy with these meaningful lyrics:

"Songs all fill your halls
Pictures bless your walls
But when buildings are all gone
Ideals will still live on
Dedicated to the Arts
Knowing certain from the start
That in life we're going far
Everyone a rising star
And we'll go on shining all because of you

More than books can give
Here, we learn to live
While basics you don't erase
The Arts must have their place

Dedicated to the Arts
Knowing certain from the start
That in life we're going far
Everyone a rising star
And we'll go on shining all because of you."

GREENHALGE MAGNET SCHOOL

Each child realizing full academic potential has been and will continue to be a goal of most schools. The Greenhalge Magnet School was developed as part of Lowell's voluntary desegregation plan providing for a successful education in the unique Human Resources/Continuous Progress Theme. Academically, every child is placed within a cluster group of his/her own ability for Reading and Language Arts. With the flexibility necessary for either remediation or advancement, each child is monitored carefully through testing, teacher assessment and the Principal's overview. Individual class groupings are carried out in self-contained classrooms at each grade level. Title I, Chapter 766 and Bilingual programs supplement regular education programs.

While the Greenhalge Magnet School is a kindergarten through grade four school, and citywide testing is for grades three through eight allowing for only two grades to be tested; dramatic results are nonetheless evident. After increasing minority enrollments from 5%, when the Greenhalge became a Magnet School, to its present 30% minority student population, the citywide testing results show the school obtaining grade level or higher averages for its departing classes and an increase in individual student achievement with more students scoring at higher percentiles in each successive year.

In order to rectify outside impediments to academic achievement for the student in school, recipient agreements exist with Community Teamwork, Inc., The Human Resources Institute, Center Counseling and Care and Reach Out. In addition to these contracted agencies, liaison and utilization for support of students and families is maintained with Solomon Mental Health Center, Rape Crisis, Stoney Brook Counseling, The International Institute and The Southeast Asian Organization.

The second task of the dual role of the Human Resource component is the enrichment of the educational experience for its students. For those outstanding students, the Greenhalge School houses the Talented and Gifted program. A 25 station computer lab enables all grade levels to participate in an innovative way to increase thinking skills, develop creative writing ability and reinforce other basic skills. Special programs, such as Multi-Cultural Fair, Health and Safety Unit and Science Fair allows the

children to display their individual and family talents. Outside agencies, i.e., Police and Fire Depoartments, State Heritage Park, Center for Field Services and World Book Co. provide personal and/or programs in support of the scholastic endeavors.

Under Chapter 636 Funding, support for materials and staff development assist the Greenhalge Magnet school to carry out its effective educational program. Without the support for staff development, the educational effectiveness would not be of such consistently high quality. Since the majority of the present staff were involved in developing the objectives, goals and activities of the magnet school at its inception, they feel responsible for its implementation. A Program Facilitator allows for a stronger parental liaison, increased staff development along with program implementation and evaluation.

From physical and specific requirements for integrating students in all areas of school activities, to creating, developing and carrying out designed programs for the promotion of a positive inter-racial and cultural learning environment; the Greenhalge Magnet School ensures that minority and low-income students are equitably treated and have equal access to the school's educational program. Classes are balanced for equity in racial composition, gender, ethnicity and special needs. Art, Music and Physical Education are physically integrated with the bilingual students amongst the classroom students and not as a small group adjunct. All materials, books, displays and programs reflect racial and ethnic awareness.

Besides concrete monitoring of the physical integration of all students, steps are taken for the learning environment to foster cultural and racial awareness. Corridor and classroom displays create a feeling of acceptance for all people throughout the year. The annual six-week Multi-Cultural Fair specifically deals with developing recognition and appreciation of each other as members of the human race and then of ethnic diversity. Staff development has included workshops on cultural awareness, in particular the Cambodian culture which reflects a significant number of minority children. All children are treated equitably and have equal access to all programs based on achievement and need.

While the Greenhalge School operated successfully before participating in the voluntary desegregation efforts of the City of Lowell; its becoming a Magnet School enabled it to receive additional funding which has benefited its ability to carry out its educational mission.

Whenever the Lowell School Department is asked to participate in a workshop, conference or meeting about parental involvement, invariably the Greenhalge School is asked to be present. The Greenhalge School would not be the same school without its parents and their support. From staffing of the Parent Center to almost every program in their children's education, they have an impact. Whether running off papers for the staff or 'publishing' the school newsletter, their effectiveness is felt. Parents have raised funds for school needs, established an annual scholarship which aids in recruitment of minority students, volunteered in the library, served on the Citywide Parent Planning Council, and helped to create corridor and lobby displays.

A formal open house is held for parents, but an open door policy is the rule. Translators are provided by the school for bilingual parents. When minority parents wish to visit the school as potential volunteers, the student and parents are given a tour of the physical structure, and observe the classes and teachers that will directly impact on the student.

The administration and staff are committed to the integration and mainstreaming of its bilingual population as soon as effectively possible. As stated before, physical integration in all areas of non-academic school life takes place immediately. Subject area mainstreaming is conducted when the student has developed enough proficiency to function in a classroom group even if support is still necessary. Other areas such as computer labs, field trips, etc., use the 'buddy' system for integration and language assistance.

If another school had a similar student/parent population, I would advise them to develop programs that would meet their needs. Survey the parents and the staff. Supportiveness and sharing by faculty and parents makes for a positive working and learning atmosphere.

Basic skills can be reinforced and enhanced with positive, personal progress geared to human awareness and development. The building administration must provide leadership in all areas and must be involved in curriculum development, as well as being a good director.

Provide a positive, warm and friendly environment where each child knows that all staff is interested in his/her physical safety and scholastic achievement. Develop a set of rules that are demanding yet attainable for the school to achieve and maintain excellence.

Emphasis should be placed on the basic skills of Reading, Math and Language Arts. Specific time schedules should be built into the school day and adhered to, as these, at the K through 4 Grade Level, are the core of learning. Monitor student's progress continuously and allow for frequent reinforcement.

Establish parent/teacher contact early in the school year and maintain it throughout the school year. This type of positive contact will cement the school/family relationship and lead to a striving commitment towards educational excellence.

New Bedford

School desegregation has been an issue in New Bedford since 1965. Repeated findings of racial imbalance at four schools by the Board of Education and demands by the local Black and Cape Verdean communities produced only a promise of new school construction sometime in the future.

In 1971 the Board voted to withhold state aid from New Bedford until the School Committee adopted a satisfactory plan. The plan which emerged called for construction of four new schools (two in white and two in predominantly minority neighborhoods) and the encouragement of voluntary transfers of minority students on a seat-available basis.

This plan also continued the Greene School, a magnet school developed largely at the initiative of Cape Verdean parents, who recruited white volunteer students as a way to integrate and strengthen their school.

Despite an agreement that the schools would be built simultaneously, the two schools in white neighborhoods opened several years before the Gomes School and Carney Academy, whose expanded attendance areas brought white students into new facilities which replaced minority-identifiable schools. By 1977, however, the new schools opened and racial balance was achieved through extensive redistricting.

During the interim, the old Carney Academy served as a successful magnet school for white students; these magnet elements at Carney Academy and at Greene were suspended with implementation of redistricting. An "enrichment program" for academically-advanced students was established at Carney Academy, however, and served to increase the school's white enrollment.

In late 1981 New Bedford adopted a revised racial balance plan, which was approved by the Board in January 1982. This revised plan reduced the number of students transported by assigning many to schools nearer their homes; this was possible because of neighborhood changes which decreased minority student concentrations in certain schools.

Over the past several years we have encouraged New Bedford to consider reinstating magnet schools to permit flexible adjustments to the racial balance plan. Planning for this is now in process.

Charles L. Glenn

NEW BEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW BEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS 02740

CONSTANTINE T. NANOPOULOS, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

STEVEN B. LAMARCHE
Administrative Assistant
Business Services

Assistant Superintendents
LUCILLE R. CARON
Special Services
WILLIAM E. CHAPMAN
Personnel Services
JOSEPH S. SILVA, JR.
Elementary Education

January 31, 1986

The New Bedford Public School System has developed several programs which deal with the issues of equity, integration and choice. These programs include part-time and full-time Talented and Gifted and Career Awareness Programs. We have also developed a multi-ethnic curriculum emphasizing the contributions of the various ethnic groups in the community.

In the early 70's, New Bedford committed itself to building four (4) new elementary schools, two of which were to correct racial imbalance in several of our neighborhood elementary schools. Our history includes a voluntary transfer program as well as the development of a magnet school. We are currently evaluating the impact of our Chapter 636 programs on our student population and are developing plans to identify magnet schools with specific themes or programs.

The New Bedford Public Schools are committed to "excellence in education" and this objective can only be achieved through equity and choice in education.

Constantine T. Nanopoulos

CONSTANTINE T. NANOPOULOS
Superintendent of Schools

CTN:gm

CHAPTER 636: MOVING ON IN NEW BEDFORD

by Diane Souza
Chapter 636 Coordinator

The New Bedford Public School System has developed three programs, funded by Chapter 636, which deal with issues of equity and integration. All three Chapter 636 funded programs provide excellent educational opportunities for New Bedford students. These programs include: T.A.G., a full-time talented and gifted program; K.I.C. (Kids Interacting Creatively), a part-time talented and gifted program; and Career Awareness.

The T.A.G. programs are housed at the Sgt. William H. Carney Memorial Academy and the Casimir Pulaski School. It is a full-time enrichment program, serving fourth, fifth and sixth grade multi-racial, multi-ethnic, multi-culture students. Besides academically enriching the basic skills curriculum, the students receive multi-ethnic, multi-racial awareness studies instruction. It is hoped that this valuable program of instruction and integration can continue during the coming years.

The K.I.C. program, housed at the Carney Academy, is a part-time enrichment program. The K.I.C. teacher services four different groups of fifteen multi-racial, multi-ethnic, multi-culture students. Each group of students is bused to Carney Academy for one full day of instruction. This program of instruction emphasizes research skills, independent study, inquiry, leadership and creativity training. Another important goal of the program is to foster and enhance personal development/ self-awareness and develop an appreciation for different cultural, ethnic, and racial backgrounds or life styles. Activities also strive to eliminate sex stereotyping. It is an outstanding program serving a diverse student population, encouraging meaningful interaction and integration.

The Career Awareness programs, at both the Carney Academy and the Alfred J. Gomes School, services students of grades

one through six, including special needs and bilingual students. Learning activities stress the basic relationship between acquisition of basic skills and future career, thus hoping to broaden and uplift the students' career and academic expectations. Activities strive to reduce stereotyping in careers based on gender or race, and foster interaction among students of diverse backgrounds. Also stressed is the importance of personal drive and self-confidence. These activities come during the children's formative years, when personal attitudes toward school and self are beginning to grow. The program is rewarding and very valuable to the Carney and Gomes students.

New Bedford has the distinct honor of claiming the first magnet school in the state of Massachusetts. Since we are now in the process of assessing district needs and evaluating the impact that Chapter 636 can have upon our schools, we are once again developing plans for neighborhood district magnet schools. These schools, offering equity and choice, will definitely help us in maintaining our objective of excellence in education. It is, indeed, an exciting time for Chapter 636 in New Bedford!

Springfield

The desegregation process in Springfield has been one of continuing development as the system adapts to a changing population and changing educational needs. Sometimes it has seemed that certain steps would never be taken, certain needs never addressed, as a result of the slow deliberative process which has characterized the community. The State has needed to remind and to prod from time to time, but never--since 1971-73, when Chapter 70 aid was impounded--to use its enforcement powers. Even more significantly, the school system has always developed its own solutions, ensured that they were educational sound, and implemented them effectively.

Intermediate school desegregation was implemented in Springfield in 1968, and the elementary reassignment plan (which created primary and upper elementary schools) in 1974. Certain school closing and magnet school elements at the elementary level were implemented in 1976, as a result of Board concerns (supported by a Supreme Judicial Court ruling) about the isolation of Hispanic students in the North End. These measures have not been entirely effective, but the system continues to work at this problem, as Vivian George's narrative demonstrates. In 1982 the Board approved an amendment to the 1974 Plan, permitting the closing of one school and changing of grade-level designation at another.

High schools in Springfield have been citywide for many years, and they have been fairly desegregated through student selections, though Classical and Putnam Vocational have become identically white by contrast with Commerce and Technical. Discussion of a high school plan had gone on for more than a decade, with periodic reminders from the State of the equal opportunity and desegregation considerations.

In June 1982 the Board approved a plan for desegregation and improvement of the distribution of male and female students at the high schools, including construction of a new facility to replace Classical and Technical, an addition to Putnam, and extensive renovation and upgrading of Commerce. In December of that year the voters approved construction by a margin of 13,500 to 8,766, and what has been named "Springfield Central High School" will open in September 1986.

Charles L. Glenn

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS of SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

Thomas J. Donahoe
Superintendent

Central Office
195 State Street
01103

February 7, 1986

Dr. Charles Glenn, Director
Bureau of Equal Education Opportunity
Massachusetts Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Dear Dr. Glenn:

At your request, we are submitting the following comments concerning our experience and the assistance and advice which you and your staff have given to us in the last several years.

In Springfield, the Six District Desegregation Plan was implemented in September 1974. The attendance district for every elementary school in the city was changed as we moved from a K-6 school system to a K-4, and 5-6 system. This change provided for integrated school classrooms despite segregated housing patterns in some sections of the city. The change was implemented by our teaching staff, principals, and administrators flawlessly. Over 5,000 pupils were bussed to a different school in September 1974 in a smooth, well organized operation. The Plan has remained basically unchanged and effective for eleven years.

The total success of this activity would have been greatly diminished without the support from the State via Chapter 636 services and programs. The technical assistance supplied by Dr. Charles Glenn and the Greater Springfield Regional Office has been outstanding. The supplementary staff provided by Section 1 of Chapter 636 has been most helpful in meeting the problems as pupils from different backgrounds were integrated in the classroom.

The magnet schools funded by Section 8 of Chapter 636 have been an important part of the desegregation efforts. Through their growth in Springfield, parents have been given the element of choice in schools and have voluntarily bussed their children out of designated districts for special programs offered as magnet attractions. This has resulted in further desegregation as racial or ethnic concentrations of pupils has occurred. Most recently, a special magnet school to attract Hispanic students was created at Sixteen Acres School. Over 100 Hispanic pupils now attend that school, reducing the Hispanic concentration in two other schools by 100 pupils. We are now planning to address the minority concentration at two other schools by creating new magnet schools to attract minority pupils.

The flexibility of Chapter 636 Section 8 has allowed the Springfield School Department to address changing concentrations of minority pupils. The creation of magnet schools to fine tune the desegregation process has allowed the Six District

Plan to remain stable, and this stability of attendance districts is an important factor in providing stability to the school system.

In summary, the success of the integration efforts in Springfield have been greatly assisted by the financial and moral support of the Chapter 636 program and staff. Change is expected, Chapter 636 has helped us to meet our changing needs.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Donahoe

THOMAS J. DONAHOE
Superintendent of Schools

CURRENT DESEGREGATION EFFORTS IN SPRINGFIELD

by Vivian G. George
Springfield Public Schools

Springfield's efforts with respect to equity, integration and choice since September of 1984 have been directed at (1) continuing to reduce the concentration of Hispanic students at Brightwood, Chestnut and Lincoln, (2) increasing Black student access to magnet schools, (3) addressing the growth of the minority population at DeBerry and Howard, (4) promoting strategies to improve integration within classrooms, and (5) planning for race and gender balance in the three high schools as the opening of Springfield Central High School approaches.

1. Reducing Hispanic School Population in District VI

September 1984 saw a new magnet school open at Sixteen Acres with an enrollment of 70 Hispanic magnet children from the Lincoln/Brightwood area. Two-way recruiting was actively carried on during the spring and proved successful for Brightwood and Lincoln as well, bringing a total of 75 magnet children to the former and 53 to the latter compared with 33 and 39 previously. The all-day kindergarten at Brightwood and the computer labs at Lincoln are seen as important factors in the increase of students attracted to these two schools. A third factor was an after-school day-care program for magnet students from these two schools and the Hispanic magnet children at the Sixteen Acres School. The program was piloted for a half year with about 18 children. Chestnut Junior High also showed substantial gains in magnet student enrollment going from 30 in 1983 to 88 in 1984.

New measures to maintain this trend were started early in 1985. A survey of parents in schools with 60% white populations provided information used to initiate a new science program for Brightwood and Lincoln, thereby completing a science strand which provides programs in investigative science from kindergarten through grade nine at magnet schools within one district. The day-care program in its second year received more publicity and was able to attract 30 children to begin its program in September 1985.

Vigorous recruiting which included a cable TV program brought impressive increases in voluntary enrollment at the targeted schools.

School	83-84	84-85	85-86
Brightwood	33	75	109
Lincoln	39	53	82
Sixteen Acres	0	70	96
Chestnut	30	88	109

The recruitment of non-Hispanic students into District VI and Hispanic students to Sixteen Acres and Van Sickle has dramatically reduced the concentration of Hispanic students at Brightwood, Lincoln, and Chestnut, as see below.

Racial Distribution

School	October 1, 1983			October 1, 1985		
	W	B	H	W	B	H
Brightwood	10%	12%	78%	27%	25%	58%
Lincoln	9	3	88	21	9	70
Sixteen Acres	69	29	2	53	20	27
Chestnut	12	11	77	17	13	70

The actual percentage of Hispanic children reported on the October 1 report this year is considerably lower than would have been the case if there was no magnet school population present.

Actual vs. Hypothetical Racial Distribution
1985-86

School	Actual			Hypothetical		
	W	B	H	W	B	H
Brightwood	27%	25%	58%	11%	10%	79%
Lincoln	21	9	70	12	5	83
Chestnut	17	13	70	10	10	80

A second option for Hispanic students at Chestnut Junior High School is also being explored this year. The creation of another magnet school for District VI junior hgih students should lower the Hispanic population at Chestnut and also help to provide a better balance at a second junior high school.

With plans for the recruitment drive for 1986-87 now being made, Springfield will continue to strengthen the desegregation impact on these four schools.

2. **Increasing Access to Magnet Schools**

The 1983-84 evaluation report pointed out that the decline of Black magnet enrollments was in large part due to the lack of space at magnets open to Black and white applicants on an equal basis. It was recommended that additional spaces be found to provide equal choices for all students. In September of 1985 the Transitional Bilingual Education program at Sumner magnet was consolidated with one at a neighboring school thus making room for additional magnet students. Preference was given to Black applicants to both Sumner and Kensington, where the waiting lists for Black students were long. Indeed, 35% of new Black applicants were placed this year compared to only 26% last year. Special attention will continue to be focused on applicants for the magnet schools for 1986-87 to ensure that equity is provided for all students.

3. **Addressing High Minority Population at DeBerry**

Springfield also began to address the growth of minority enrollment at DeBerry and Howard during the 1984-85 school year. A Transitional Bilingual Education program was started in District IV where none had existed. This move took Hispanic children out of DeBerry (where they had been bussed for services) and returned them to their neighborhood district. The minority population at DeBerry remains at about 80%, however, and the development of a magnet school to attract minority students to a predominantly White school is in the early planning stages for 1986-87 implementation. In addition, a complementary plan to create a magnet at DeBerry to attract White students from three schools in that District where White percent of population stands at 60% or more was proposed and will be thoroughly explored. A large rehab project in the Howard School district makes new population figures uncertain at this time; Howard enrollments will be carefully monitored.

4. **Improving Integration Gains**

Data from the 1984-85 evaluation report show that the cross-racial selection (CRS) rate for the year was at the highest level ever recorded. Forty-four percent (44%) of all student selections were cross-racial

compared to 30% seven years ago. While there are differences within groups, and work remains to be done, progress for 1984-85 was encouraging. New figures collected in January from the fall of 1985 sociograms also showed a CRS rate of 44%, thus matching the rate recorded during the previous year.

Computer analysis of data now makes it possible to compare actual rate of cross-racial selections to the expected rate if students were selected totally at random based on racial distribution of the individual classrooms. At mid-year the ratio of actual to expected CRS (with 1.00 as a target figure) was 0.69, equal to the ratio at the end of last year. Areas for improvement will be analyzed in 1985-86 in order that specific groups may be identified and encouraged, through planned activities, to move forward in achieving Springfield's integration goals in 1986-87.

5. **Planning for Race/Gender Balance at The High Schools**

During the 1984-85 school year the focus in high school planning continued in the direction of staff and curriculum development. Activities which aimed at bringing together teachers from Classical & Technical to prepare to become a single faculty, were again emphasized. New curriculum for Putnam Vocational Technical, curriculum for integrating special needs high school students and curriculum for the Transitional Bilingual Education program at Springfield Central were also part of the 1984-85 achievements.

In 1985-86, several activities to bring students from Classical & Technical together were planned and are being implemented. With the opening of Springfield Central only eight months away, efforts this Spring will focus on helping 9th grade students and their parents to examine carefully the programs offered at each school. Assistance in making the important decision of school selection will be provided by guidance counselors (who have recently completed workshop training to familiarize them with the available programs), by visits to the schools, arranged by the guidance department, and by open evening discussion meetings.

The progress report sent to the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity notes that "the Research Department has continued to analyze the factors which

influence a student's choice of a high school. A valid understanding of those factors will enable the School Department to develop more sophisticated strategies to encourage students to consider non-traditional courses and careers."

The 1986-87 school year will prove to be another year of challenge for Springfield.

ARMORY STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The Armory Street Elementary School is one of ten magnet schools in Springfield. Built in 1900, Armory is one of the oldest schools in the city, but one that has been well preserved thanks to the continuing dedication of the fine custodial staff. The present enrollment stands at 537 in grades K, 5 and 6. The racial distribution of 43% white, 20% non-white, 34% Hispanic, and 2% Asian is closely representative of the citywide racial distribution at the elementary level, though the percentage of low income students at Armory, approximately 67%, is considerably above the citywide average. The present magnet student enrollment of 153 comprises 28% of the school population and represents the highest number of magnet students ever to attend Armory.

This school has, for several years, maintained a highly successful educational program for all students. Achievement test results at Armory have always been among the highest in the city and have shown consistent improvement over time. For example, in the nine-year period from 1976 to the present, obtained achievement levels at Armory in the grade 6 citywide testing have averaged five months higher than anticipated levels (based upon results of an ability test). Armory's national percentile scores in both reading and math have improved from the 49th percentile in 1976 to the 78th and 77th percentile, respectively, in 1984. Improved achievement has been recorded by students in each racial/ethnic subgroup. National percentiles in reading over this period improved from the 56th percentile to to the 64th percentile for non-white students, and from the 12th percentile to the 50th percentile for Hispanic students. National percentile in mathematics improved from the 58th percentile to the 77th percentile for white students, from the 40th percentile to the 56th percentile for black students, and from the 31st percentile to the 48th percentile for Hispanic students.

Armory Street School has also always made every effort to provide a quality integrated educational experience for all students. The effectiveness of efforts to achieve integration can be seen in the continuing increase in cross-racial friendships recorded on the yearly sociogram testing at Armory. The cross-racial selection rate at Armory has increased from 28% in 1978 to 50% in 1985 and has been consistently above the citywide average.

The origin of the success at Armory can, perhaps, be traced back to the first year of desegregation in Springfield when

Armory changed from a K-6 to a K,5,6 school. The principal and staff, most of them new to the building, spent one week prior to the opening of school jointly planning the safe, effective, and efficient operation of the school. This teamwork and involvement of the staff in all aspects of the school has continued and is the cornerstone of the success of Armory. The program at Armory, as originally conceived, is centered around a structured, teacher-centered, integrated, self-contained classroom program. Students are assigned to classrooms on the basis of reading groups (with regard to racial distribution and teaching/learning styles), two reading groups per teacher. Teachers are responsible for teaching all subjects, with only limited movement within a "cluster" (i.e., for math instruction, also grouped by ability). Two clusters of four teachers at each grade level operate independently, each with their own schedule, which helps to maximize the utilization of city, bilingual, Chapter I, and Chapter 636 support staff. These support staff, as well as classroom teachers, utilize the Dolphin computer assisted instruction and management system to diagnose student needs, provide additional experiences in deficient skill areas, and chart student progress over time.

The numerous enrichment opportunities that are available for the students at Armory also help to make the school effective. For example, students of all ability levels participate in the Chapter 636 reading/language arts enrichment program in which students read noteworthy children's literature followed by detailed discussions, vocabulary development, and special projects. All students also participate in the Chapter 636 computer enrichment program, beginning with computer literacy and concluding with introductory BASIC programming. Other activities for students based on skill and/or interest level include a school newspaper (which has won numerous awards from the Columbia Scholastic Press Association), a literacy magazine, and a local television broadcast (all of which are made possible through Chapter 636 funding), as well as a school band and school chorus.

The self-contained classroom program at Armory allows students to establish and maintain meaningful relationships with their peers and allows teachers to establish a more personal and caring relationship with their students, both of which further the goal of integration. The additional opportunities for students to participate in enrichment activities with students of similar interests also help to promote integration.

Parents have always been encouraged to become involved at Armory Street School. An open-door policy means that

parents are welcome to visit the school or to meet with principal or teachers at any time. Continuous communication with parents is maintained through the school newsletters, monthly calendars, and parent-teacher conferences. In addition, teachers are encouraged to call a parent not only if a child is having difficulty, but also if a child has shown particular success. All parents are also encouraged to volunteer within the school. This year, for example, a number of Hispanic parents are tutoring students in the TBE program.

In conclusion, the "secret" to providing an effective desegregated school is to plan for the most efficient utilization of staff and resources (involving staff in that planning) and to maintain continual lines of communication between principal, teachers, parents, and students in carrying out that plan. By following the philosophy that sound planning and organization are the cornestones of success, success can be accomplished.

INDIAN ORCHARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Indian Orchard School, a K-4 elementary school in Springfield, recently celebrated its sixtieth year of operation. Though Indian Orchard, like all elementary schools in Springfield, participates in the citywide desegregation plan, it is very close to being a neighborhood school as most students walk to school. The school currently enrolls over 400 students with a racial distribution of 60% white (over 100 of whom are Portuguese), 26% non-white, 13% Hispanic, and 1% Asian. As 67% of the student population is considered to be low-income, Indian Orchard School qualifies for Chapter I services. A Chapter 636 program in basic skills and a Portuguese Transitional Bilingual program are also available at Indian Orchard.

Student achievement at Indian Orchard has improved considerably in the last few years. In 1976, students were at the 39th percentile in reading and in math. In 1984, students scored at the 56th percentile in reading and at the 64th percentile in math. In the last two years student obtained achievement was four and six months, respectively, above anticipated achievement on the Metropolitan Basic Battery. White, Black, and Hispanic students all recorded higher obtained than anticipated achievement on the most recent testing.

Equally as important, great progress in integration has been made at Indian Orchard in the last seven years. In 1978 the percentage of student sociogram selections that were cross-racial stood at 21%. This has more than doubled to 54% on the most recent testing. Similarly, the ratio of actual cross-racial selections made to those anticipated by chance has more than doubled, from 0.46 in 1978 to 1.00 this year (meaning that the actual CRS rate equaled the expected rate, indicative of "total" integration). The rate of improvement over time on both measures of integration is one of the highest in the city.

With the arrival of a new principal in 1977 a number of physical and organizational changes were made at Indian Orchard which helped to make the school more effective. Interior painting, new furniture and new flooring were quickly accomplished. Some staff changes were also implemented, capitalizing on the strengths of teachers to best meet the needs of the students. After briefly experimenting with having students change classes for reading and math, the staff decided to maintain heterogeneous self-contained classrooms, as they felt that students at this age level needed the stability of relating to only one teacher. Classroom teachers, for the most part, teach all subjects to the students in their classrooms, assisted as necessary by Chapter I, Chapter 636, and bilingual support staff. By working with their students for most of every school day, teachers truly get to know the strengths and weaknesses of their students. Students also, by working alongside their peers for most of the school day, develop and maintain friendships more easily, and students who learn more slowly benefit from exposure to students of average and above average ability.

The success of the program at Indian Orchard can be attributed to the excellence of the teaching staff and to the excellent rapport that exists between teachers and students. The staff is often complimented by substitute teachers and by parents who works above and beyond the call of duty. The teachers at Indian Orchard not only possess fine teaching skills, but are also vitally interested in each and every child and are highly sensitive to the needs of every child. This "human element" in teaching is, in the opinion of staff at this school, extremely important for youngsters at the lower elementary school level.

Parents and community volunteers are also an important aspect of the success of the program at Indian Orchard. Parents are extremely cooperative in resolving any problems with their children and are very active in the school in many ways. Through frequent newsletters and bulletins,

which are sent out in both English and Portuguese, communication with all parents is maintained. Many parents are also actively involved in the Chapter I PAC, the Bilingual PAC, and PTO. The PTO meets on a regular basis, with meetings centering around the interests of parents as determined at the initial meeting. This group has also conducted book sales, a book bag sale, candy sales, and other fund raisers to finance equipment and materials for teachers, field trips, and library books. A large number of volunteers have also assisted the school by listening to student reports for the Friendly Read-A-Thon program, by tutoring students, and by assisting in the school library. In fact the school library was recently dedicated in honor of one volunteer, a former teacher-aide who volunteers almost full-time in the school library. Corporate volunteers from a local insurance company have also been of great assistance in working with Portuguese students being mainstreamed from the TBE program.

The heterogenous self-contained classroom organization at Indian Orchard not only promotes achievement but also integration, as students of each ability level and racial or ethnic group learn to work together, play together, and respect one another as equals. Other efforts which have helped to enhance integration include mini-courses, Chapter 636 funded multicultural performances, and integrated enrichment activities such as a school chorus and school newspaper.

The basic philosophy of this school, as carried out by classroom teachers, is one of mutual respect between teacher and child. Teachers at Indian Orchard make a concerned effort to build on the strengths of their students, promoting a positive self-image in each child as well as a sense of responsibility. In the opinion of the teachers at this school, "competence comes through confidence," and the efforts of teachers to build confidence can be seen in each classroom where a warm, stimulating teaching environment can be seen. Teachers continually strive to communicate to each child a sense of personal worth. One technique which teachers use to accomplish this is to periodically award P.O.B. (Pat on The Back) certificates to students who have shown exceptional progress. Teachers also strive to create classrooms which resemble family units, conveying the sense of "family" prevalent among the teaching staff itself. Establishing an atmosphere of mutual respect where both teachers and students can feel comfortable, happy, and successful, where the objective is to teach the child more than the subject, and where both teachers and students have a sense of personal accountability is the key to providing an effective desegregated school.

WHITE STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

White Street School, serving students in grades K-4, was built in 1905, though with the growth of the neighborhood population, an annex was constructed in 1931. Since the early 1970's the school population has changed considerably, from a predominantly white, blue-collar, working class student population to a population consisting of an increasing number of minority students (particularly Hispanic) and students from single-parent families. The present racial distribution of 50% white, 21% non-white, and 30% Hispanic is sizably different from the 1973 population of 87% white, 10% non-white, and 2% Hispanic. The Hispanic population, only 4% of the total population in 1979, has multiplied more than seven-fold in only six years. In addition to a growing minority population, White Street School has seen a steady increase in the number of economically deprived students to the point that more than two-thirds of the students are now classified as low-income.

Despite the rapid changes in the racial composition and economic level of the population in the last ten years, students at White Street have consistently performed well on citywide achievement testing. On the most recent testing, for example, student obtained achievement was 18 months above anticipated achievement on the Metropolitan Basic Battery, the largest differential in the city. Since 1978 students at White Street have had an average obtained achievement level five months greater than the expected level with an average national percentile of 65 in reading and 64 in math. Achievement gains have been made by each racial/ethnic group to the extent that the average achievement levels of white, non-white, and Hispanic students were all above the national norm on both the grade 3 and grade 4 testing in 1985.

In addition to progress in achievement, students at White Street, despite the noted changes in racial composition, have made substantial gains in integration. The percentage of student friendship selections that were cross-racial has almost doubled over the last seven years, from 24% of all selections in 1978 to 46% in 1985. This rate of increase is one of the highest in the city.

A number of factors have been instrumental to the success of the educational program at White Street School. Beginning with the belief that parent perceptions of a school are important to its succcess and that test results are an

important measuring stick in the eyes of parents, a concerted effort to increase achievement levels was initiated upon the arrival of a new principal in 1979. The attitude that all children can, should, and will learn in an atmosphere of mutual respect became the building philosophy. This philosophy together with staff and organizational changes helped teachers to become more effective. The reading coordinator was given total control of the reading program, with responsibility for continuous monitoring, placement of students, and ordering or producing of materials. The principal took complete responsibility for coordinating the mathematics program, utilizing the Mathematics Assessment and Prescriptive Program developed by the Mathematics Department of the Springfield Public Schools, an objective-based program with periodic monitoring of student progress. The reading time allotment in grades 1 and 2 was increased from the normal 90 minutes by an additional 45-minute afternoon reading session in the basal text. The morning time period from 9:15 until 11:45 was devoted to reading, language arts, and mathematics. During this time period, students were assigned to work with classroom teachers or support staff for basic skills instruction in a non-pullout, self-contained, homogeneous grouping situation, providing greater stability for both students and teachers and enabling a pupil-teacher ratio of 15:1 or less. A Transitional Bilingual Program, limited to approximately 15 students, was provided for students who lacked sufficient skills or maturity for grade 1 placement, enabling the first grade teachers to offer a true grade 1 program and also enabling the school to remediate skill deficiencies at an early age. Finally, a greater sense of pride in school and in performance, on the part of both teachers and students, was developed. This increase in esprit de corps within the school spread into the parent community resulting in the development of strong PTO.

Parents are an integral part of the total educational program at White Street School. Parents, both white and minority, are actively involved in the bilingual PAC, Chapter I PAC, Chapter 636 planning, as well as the PTO. The PTO has been instrumental in numerous fundraisers such as white elephant sales and bake sales. Parents have also volunteered to assist the school as library aides and classroom tutors and turn out in large numbers for frequent special programs and performances. By providing a place where parents feel comfortable and a school that parents can be proud of, a high level of parent involvement is assured. Integration is continually promoted in every aspect of the educational program at White Street School. Chapter 636 funding has been of great assistance in this effort. In the Chapter 636 science program, for example, students conduct

investigations in small integrated groups on a regular basis. As a result of the Chapter 636 funded music enrichment program, students learn songs and dances of other cultures and participate in a school chorus and various musical productions. A Chapter 636 reading/language arts enrichment program, involving third and fourth grade students in producing a school newspaper, also helps to further integration.

Hispanic students at White Street School at both the third and fourth grade levels are achieving higher than expected and are above the national average. This outstanding record of achievement is a tribute to the outstanding efforts of classroom teachers and bilingual staff and to rapid movement of students into the mainstream, facilitated by use, while in ESL, of the same basal reading series and math series used by English speaking students at the school, one of the first schools in the city to accomplish this.

In conclusion, the success of the educational program at White Street School has been the result of hard work by all staff to institute the philosophy that all students can, should, and will learn. By utilizing the talents of the staff to the fullest, by setting realistic goals, and by establishing an environment conducive among the staff and the students, White Street School has been and will continue to be successful.

Worcester

The minority population in Worcester is a much smaller part of overall public school enrollment than is the case in Boston or Springfield, and the desegregation challenge in the three communities cannot be compared, but the progress made in Worcester over the past several years is significant. Despite the extreme difficulty of coming to grips with desegregation without Court intervention--as in Boston and Springfield--the leadership of the Worcester Public Schools resolved at last to do so, and were able to draw upon the support of a broad range of staff and parents. Worcester is in its own way a notable success story for local leadership, for parent choice, and for desegregation.

In 1978 the Worcester public school enrollment was 13% minority compared with 45% in Springfield and 60% in Boston. There were three elementary schools with a majority of Hispanic and Black students: Clark Street (73%), Chandler Street (69%), and Woodland Street (53%). Together these schools enrolled nearly half (47%) of the Hispanic elementary students in Worcester.

In 1979 EEO began to discuss with the system the prospective closing of a number of schools as a result of declining enrollment. It was clear that several of the proposals would have the effect of increasing the isolation of minority students at Chandler and Woodland Street Schools unless they were combined with deliberate efforts to reduce that isolation. To complicate the planning task, earlier decisions of the system appeared to have contributed to the problem, and in at least one instance the state had provided the financial support and so would be implicated if litigation were to develop, as it had in Boston, Holyoke and Springfield. Finally, it was clear that a substantial number of elementary students were not attending their "neighborhood schools," and that the voluntary movement of

white students was contributing to minority isolation, and the involuntary movement of Hispanic students was creating inequities.

When the School Committee adopted a school closing plan, in 1980, which did not take account of the need to correct minority isolation and its own potential legal liability, it was clear that the Board and School Committee might soon be in court, either as adversaries or as co-defendants in a suit brought on behalf of minority students. Such a suit was in fact already pending, bearing upon bilingual education and related issues, and the plaintiffs showed interest in broadening it to raise the basic constitutional issues which permitted such a sweeping remedy in Boston. The Commissioner was clear that it was primarily the Board's obligation to protect the constitutional rights of minority students, and that it was essential that Worcester develop a remedy to minority isolation and to any unconstitutional practices which would be in effect when the proposed school closings took effect, in September 1981.

After extensive negotiations, technical assistance, and local school/community planning, the Worcester School Committee adopted a preliminary desegregation plan on June 18, 1981. This plan included moderate redistricting, consolidation of bilingual programs in fewer schools, located near but not in the areas of heaviest Hispanic concentration, and development of three magnet schools.

EEO was not able to recommend approval of this plan due to concerns over its stability, actual effectiveness, and failure to resolve several outstanding complaints of the Hispanic community about educational support for Hispanic students. On the other hand, the plan represented substantial enough progress that we did not oppose its implementation in September 1981 as a prudent first step in the development of a long-range and stable solution to minority isolation. Chapter 636 funding was provided for continuing development and implementation of the magnet options, and for educational support as students were transferred.

The first stage of implementation, in September 1981, consisted of the mandatory redistricting and program relocation measures; it was followed, in September 1982, with the first round of voluntary transfers to magnet schools. Worcester has continued to enlarge its magnet program each year, with ten schools in 1985-86.

Charles L. Glenn

WORCESTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS EFFORTS REGARDING EQUITY, INTEGRATION, AND CHOICE DURING SCHOOL YEAR 1985-86 AND PLANS FOR THE 1986-87 SCHOOL YEAR

by Thomas P. Friend, Associate Superintendent for Education/Research and Development

In order to fully understand the position of the Worcester Public Schools in the spring of 1986, it is necessary to briefly review the events of the past ten years.

Worcester historically has had a very small minority population, essentially represented by a black population of 2 to 3%. In the early 1970's, there began to appear signs of future changes. These signs were represented by the establishment of a Hispanic community. Starting slowly, the number of Hispanics in the City of Worcester began to increase dramatically through the mid 1970's until 1979 when the Hispanic population of the Worcester Public Schools had increased to 8 %. Complicating the issue, was the fact that, although Worcester remained a majority community, it developed several schools with significant minority populations. This came about as a result of housing patterns within the City of Worcester.

Worcester recognized these trends and established Magnet Programs at Clark Street School to service the northern portion of the city as early as 1976. Something needed to occur in order to require the City to come to grips with a substantial problem in terms of the isolation of its minority students. That something, was the impetus of school closings brought about by Proposition 2-1/2.

The Worcester Public Schools' Administration, along with the School Committee, began to seriously address the issues of minority isolation during school year 1981-82. It examined a number of potential solutions to address the situation. After a full year of meetings in various areas of the city, it was determined that a Magnet School solution should be sought.

This Magnet School solution would have as its heart, the issue of equity, integration, and choice. The State Department of Education assisted Worcester substantially during this period of time. Of most significance, was its support of a Magnet School Coordinator who would oversee and develop a series of Magnet Schools which would meet the needs of the City of Worcester.

With this organization in place, the public schools proceeded on an orderly process to first establish a short-ranged minority deisolation plan which was followed up with a long-range deisolation plan. Over the past four years, the network of Magnet School Programs has been enlarged to nine elementary schools, one middle school, and a proposed senior high school. This enlargement of the program has been spurred by the continuing growth both in numbers and percentage of minority students with the largest increases coming from the Hispanic and Asian populations.

Since September, 1984, the Administration of the Worcester Public Schools has assessed the status of its programs and reviewed with the Planning Department of the City of Worcester, the prognosis for the future. Worcester recognizes that the minority population is still as concentrated as in its earlier times, but is now beginning to become numerically, substantially larger.

It appears, at this writing, that the long-range deisolation plan, that has assisted Worcester since 1983, will once again need to be modified to meet current needs. Certain areas of the city have evolved into such a high proportion of minorities, that the existing plan will no longer effectively provide solutions.

The Worcester Public Schools considers its Magnet Schools a suitable solution. It has begun planning to more directly address the issue by studying the establishment of other Magnet Schools servicing defined areas, as well as, reviewing the possibility of providing citywide Magnet Programs in designated areas. It is looking at establishing a student assignment policy and broadening the location of existing Bilingual Programs.

Worcester is confident that with the involvement of parents, the School Committee, the City Couuncil, and the community at large, it will meet all the needs of its students over the coming years.

It is to be recognized that the support and encouragement of the State Department of Education, Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity, as well as the Regional Office, will be essential to Worcester's success.

ADAMS STREET EAST SIDE PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Adams Street East Side Preparatory School is a kindergarten through grade six magnet elementary school that offers a highly structured environment in which children (and therefore their parents) know exactly what is expected of each student, exactly what standards are being used to evaluate student progress and what the disciplinary rules are that all students must follow.

All instruction is teacher-directed -- teachers plan and evaluate all of the lessons and assignments, based on the various needs children have. The curriculum focuses on the teaching of all of the basic skills and also on teaching children how to develop their critical thinking skills. The school also provides all of the children with opportunities for self-expression and creativity through music and the applied arts.

Prior to its development into a magnet school, Adams Street School served a neighborhood whose school age population had dwindled so that its K-6 program had but 73 students of which three were minority students. Today Adams Street East Side Preparatory School has a student body of 179 children in those same grades. The racial breakdown of the school is American Indian 2, Black 38, Asian 1, Hispanic 35 and White 103.

Adams Street East Side Preparatory School recruits students from contiguous school neighborhoods and has been popular with both minority and majority parents. The school has a strong Chapter I, program that serves the 121 low income students that are enrolled in the school.

The school offers an all-day kindergarten and also houses one of the city's largest Headstart programs. There is a direct continuity that has been established between the Headstart program and the school's kindergarten classes.

A cooperative program with the Early Childhood Education Department at Worcester State College enables the school to assess the potential learning problems that primary age children may have and to develop remedial strategies.

An "Outreach Program" operated in collaboration with Friendly House, a neighborhood agency, enables the school to provide children with learning experiences in social interaction, nutrition and health.

The school also operates a highly successful RSVP (Retired Senior Volunteers Program) in which ten senior citizens volunteer their time and energy to work with students in the school, helping children to develop their reading skills and also teach courses such as arts and crafts, sewing and crocheting.

Parents were directly involved in the planning of this magnet school and continue to be involved at every turn. The planning of the magnet quality of the school was conducted by a group of volunteer parents who assisted the Magnet Planning Office in determining the educational philosophy, the academic organization and the plans for continued parental involvement.

In addition to the regular parents organization, a Mothers and Fathers Club serves to help new parents know that they and their children are welcomed to the school and made comfortable. This is particularly important for those parents and children who are coming to the school from other neighborhoods in the city and need to be assured that their children will be safe and happy in this school. The Mothers and Fathers Club also assumes the small cost of the RSVP program.

The parent group is also developing a parent handbook for use by all of the school's parents. A parent committee helps the school administration in developing a wide range of arts and crafts activities.

BURNCOAT MIDDLE SCHOOL

The Burncoat Middle Magnet School is a grade 7-8 middle school housing 639 students, with a 35.2% minority population. The racial breakdown of the school is American Indian 7, Black 26, Asian 4, Hispanic 188, and White 414. The school has the largest minority population of any secondary school in Worcester. The school houses 101 bilingual students, the total Hispanic bilingual population of the city's middle school grades. The school is part of a secondary school complex that also contains Burncoat Senior High School, thus enabling the two schools to work together to establish curricular continuities from grades 7 through 12.

The school offers five different programs, with students "clustered" within each of the programs, thus creating essentially a set of five sub-schools within the larger magnet school. The five programs are:

A Traditional Classical Core Program:
This option is designed for students who have excelled in elementary school and who will thrive in a challenging academic atmosphere. It includes the study of a foreign language at honors level, the offerings are Latin I, Spanish I, or French I, in the seventh grade, and opportunities for acceleration in any major discipline. Students eligible for this program on the basis of teacher recommendations and achievement scores in elementary school.

A Traditional College Core Program:
This option was created for students who have a serious desire to continue their education beyond the high school level. It helps students to develop the necessary skills to succeed in higher education and prepares students for the academic core program at the high school level. Students are selected for this program on the basis of scores and recommendations.

A Fine Arts Program:
This option supplements the traditional classical and college core programs with a two year concentration in an area of the fine and performing arts selected by the student, including dance, theater, painting and instrumental music. If a student chooses one of these subjects, the study of the subject can be continued through the high school years at Burncoat Senior.

A Computer Technology Program:
This option supplements the traditional classical and college core programs with a two year concentration in computer technology, essentially offering the standard 9th grade computer course in the 7th grade. This program, too, is continued at the high school level at Burncoat Senior.

A Career Exploration Program:
This option clusters students together with a team of teachers and work on inter-disciplinary subjects that offer a solid foundation in basic skills and remediation where necessary. The program includes career exploration and development of decision making skills and helps students to integrate school experiences with life-time goals and working styles. Career exploration students may also take part in the Arts and Computer Programs.

Weekly after-school meetings of teams of teachers and administrators, representing all programs at the school are held to assess programs and recommend changes. These meetings have resulted in the integration of Bilingual students into all aspects of the school curricular. Students in the Bilingual program and those exiting from the Bilingual program have access with support when needed. Currently 30 students in the Bilingual Program take enrichment courses in the Magnet Programs.

Due to the limited time available for accessing bilingual students to enrichment programs, in the future, creative scheduling will be utilized to further integrate and access additional bilingual students into the Magnet Program. In addition, this year's recruiting strategies will encourage new enrollees to indicate areas of interest and every effort will be made to involve all students in all programs.

The school also features a strong Parent Advisory Council, which serves as the school's organized parent group. To date, some forty-five parents have become members, including minority parents. One of the tasks of the school's full-time magnet facilitator is the development of this Council.

The education of the school's students has improved markedly over the past year. Seventh grade student attendance is up over the previous non-magnet years. For the period of September to November 1984, the attendance rate was 84.6%. The same period in 1985 the attendance rate was 93.8%.

Burncoat Middle Magnet School would recommend to other schools contemplating a similar program that they stress the involvement of the total community in the planning and operation of any and all magnet programs. People - both parents and students - tend to give much greater support to what they have helped to create and what they have chosen to participate in.

Membership in the parent advisory council of the Burncoat Middle Magnet School has increased from 20 members in 1984, to 29 members in 1985.

ELM PARK COMMUNITY SCHOOL

Elm Park Community School is a K-6 school housing some 550 students. It is located in the central part of Worcester, a setting which allows the school to take advantage of many of the rich cultural resources in the city, including the Worcester Art Museum, the Worcester Historical Museum, Clark University, Worcester State College, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester Heritage Society, the Massachusetts Audubon Society and Worcester Performing Arts.

The school's population is made up of a diversity of racial and socio-economic groups. The minority population of the school is 52% including 33% Hispanic, 12% Black and the remaining 7% includes Asians, Native American and Greek bilingual students. Many of these children come from one-parent homes and receive free breakfast and lunch.

Elm Park offers a curriculum that is enriched with a large number of specialized programs, especially in the fine and performing arts. Being a community school, Elm Park is also able to offer after school programs for children and evening programs for adults.

One of the school's major project is a joint cooperative program with the nearby Worcester Art Museum called ArtPartnership, an arts-infused social studies program being conducted this year for kindergarten through grade 4 and next year for the entire school, grades K through six.

This program, conducted both at the school and the museum, emphasizes the concepts of art as language, art as both an object and as history, and social studies as a discipline. Students and faculty at the school work collaboratively with Museum personnel on a wide range of topics and projects that concentrate on both the teaching of basic skills and the acquisition of art skills. Students make frequent visits to the Museum for both the observation and study of the art works in the Museum's collection and for the development of their own artistic skills. The work in the arts is then built into the complete social studies (and basic skills) curriculum of the school.

In addition to the ArtsPartnership program, Elm Park offers a variety of other special project activities, including a PEAK program (Providing Enrichment for Able Kids) funded by the Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities, a Basic Skills and Visual Arts Program (also with the

Worcester Art Museum), and several special early intervention programs for students with behavioral or academic problems.

As part of its community school program, Elm Park also offers an extended day program involving students in computers, woodworking, the arts, drama and athletics.

Since Elm Park is a community school, its philosophy is based on the idea of total community involvement and especially upon the involvement of parents in their children's learning.

The school has a strong Parent Advisory Council component that attempts to involve all of the school's parents. The Council, for instance, sponsors a pre-school program for three and four year olds who pay tuition to attend. Council meetings are held regularly every month, and parents are invited to come into the school at all times to observe and help out in their children's classes.

For inner city schools dealing with a wide range of students, Elm Park recommends that such schools make special efforts to reach out to the total community and involve as many institutions of higher education, cultural and artistic institutions and groups as possible, to involve the total school community in the learning process for students and especially to involve parents in meaningful ways in the education of their children.

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR LINGUISTIC MINORITY STUDENTS

A Comprehensive Approach to our Leading Civil Rights Challenge

by Charles L. Glenn

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Public schools in Massachusetts are not providing an effective education for thousands of linguistic minority students. As a number of recent reports have pointed out, a high proportion of our Hispanic students are dropping out of school after years of academic failure and frustration, while others are relegated to courses of study with little "pay-off". Similar problems may be arising for other language groups that are less easily tracked through the racial/ethnic categories used in school reports.

The Commonwealth has taken the lead among the states in addressing a number of equity issues, including race desegregation (1965) and equal access unlimited by race, sex, religion or national origin (1972). These laws and their vigorous enforcement have produced unquestionable benefits for linguistic minority students. Doors have been opened, rights have been secured, curriculum and attitudes have changed. It is clear, however, that we have not done enough. We must not, in the words of the old freedom song, invite Hispanic or Cape Verdean or Haitian students to "sit at the Freedom Table," then put nothing in front of them to eat!

Educational equity is more than "equal opportunity" with unequal means. It must include an effective education for each student. We have assumed for too long that teaching

the rudiments of the English language exhausted our responsibility to make education effective for linguistic minority students. The fourteen years that have passed since our pioneering Transitional Bilingual Education Act was enacted, years in which thousands of dedicated teachers and administrators have worked to implement it for tens of thousands of students, have demonstrated that we must see that responsibility in a much broader context. The analysis which follows is not about bilingual education as such, but about that broader context of educational equity.

After a discussion of the enrollment trends for the major linguistic minority groups in our schools, the report reviews the performance of Hispanic students in the most recent basic skills assessment, and other indicators of our failure to provide many of them with an effective education. This discussion is not as complete as would be desirable, since no standardized achievement data are available statewide for most linguistic minority students. Indeed, the concurrent review of the large bilingual program in Boston, a follow-up to Court-ordered monitoring in 1985, reveals tremendous confusion about when and how to assess such achievement.

The report then suggests ten elements of a comprehensive approach to meeting our educational responsibilities to linguistic minority students. This is by no means a definitive list; the urban educators around the Commonwealth who reviewed it in March made a number of additional suggestions, some of which it was possible to incorporate within a document of reasonable length. Some would give a different emphasis or priority, though none of the elements was rejected as inappropriate or contrary to their experience and judgment. These are the elements that stood out from an equal educational opportunity perspective:

- Each linguistic minority student, whether "limited English-speaking" or not, should have a frequently-updated educational program that is based upon an assessment of his or her language development needs.

- Students with previous formal schooling in another language should be able to continue to master subject matter in that language while learning English.

- Early childhood programs, including those that reach into the home, are of critical importance, and represent perhaps our best new opportunity to achieve educational equity. The role of native

language and of English in such programs requires careful planning.

- Well-designed bilingual education programs are of tremendous value in creating the cognitive and linguistic basis for the mastery of English. They can also play an important role in fostering an appreciation of our diverse cultural heritages, a responsibility that they share with regular programs.

- Development of a full mastery of the English language is a long-term process, and should continue for years beyond the point when it is appropriate for a student to be mainstreamed into a regular course of study. Our schools need more fully-trained teachers of English as a Second Language to work both within and beyond bilingual programs.

- Linguistic minority students, including those whose primary language is English, should receive support as needed in language development within the context of regular classroom instruction. Teachers require in-service training in how to provide such support, and to integrate it with other activities.

- Students should be able to move flexibly back and forth between separate bilingual programs and the regular course of study, as they are ready for more challenge or need more support.

- Bilingual programs must not become "academic dead-ends" in which students continue for year after year without developing sufficient English-language proficiency to benefit from the regular course of study.

- Language and cultural maintenance should be available on an optional basis for all linguistic minority students, including those who have been mainstreamed or have not required a transitional bilingual program. The development of a number of magnet schools in which two languages and cultures are equally valued and taught to an integrated student body is a step forward for the quality of education.

- The information currently available on the academic progress of linguistic minority students in Massachusetts is woefully insufficient. Accurate and usable assessments are needed at every level, from the classroom teacher to the State Board, in the interest of providing an effective program to each student.

There are two general policy conclusions that may be drawn from this review. The first is that we must become much more clear about our expectations, much more willing to assess on an on-going basis how linguistic minority students are doing. It is unacceptable to deduce their educational difficulties from a high drop-out rate! Local and state accountability for results should become far more explicit.

The second is that the process of language acquisition is not a simple matter of learning to "get by," but requires on-going developmental support well beyond the point when a separate bilingual program ceases to be an appropriate placement. This means that the entire K-12 curriculum must provide opportunities to increase mastery of English, even for students for whom it is their "first language." The responsibility cannot be left to bilingual program staff alone; and additional resources for language development support should not be limited to students in bilingual programs.

This leads, in turn, to the recognition that all of the staff of each school serving linguistic minority students should acquire a sound understanding of the principles of language acquisition and the teaching skills needed to support it. Some should develop advanced professional skills in the teaching of English as a Second Language, a specialty too often practiced without sufficient training.

The report concludes by calling upon bilingual education specialists to bring their skills and cultural sensitivity to bear upon improving the overall effectiveness of our schools which enroll linguistic minority students. Only by such a comprehensive approach will real educational equity be achieved for these students, and an enriched education for every student.

INTRODUCTION

For at least the last five years the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity has been stressing that the major equity issues in education in Massachusetts have to do with linguistic minority--especially but by no means exclusively Hispanic--students who are not in bilingual programs. We have urged that attention be given to students who have completed bilingual programs and are having difficulty in the "mainstream," to Hispanic high school students, to refugee students, to "low incidence populations" of students of a language group too small locally to require a bilingual program.

This is by no means to say, of course, that the state can relax its vigilance about issues of access, or the educational experience of Black students, or the continuing challenge of racial integration which goes beyond the numbers. It is precisely in seeking solutions to these problems--and they are by no means resolved--that we have seen the results of our efforts limited again and again by difficulties related to language. How can the kind of integration and mutual respect that a dozen desegregating cities are seeking to foster become real, for example, if children are rigidly separated by language? What is the significance of increasing access for minority students to a Boston Latin School or other outstanding program if a high proportion of them are ill-prepared to take advantage of the opportunity? If our equity efforts are not to be limited, in their impact, to a fortunate few for whom race or national origin is the only barrier to opportunity, they must be concerned with the effectiveness of our schools.

The discussion that follows assumes that educational effectiveness has two components which must be carefully balanced and adjusted for each student: one is support , the other is challenge. Only an educational program which provides adequate support but which also expects and challenges a student to achieve excellence can be considered effective. Such a program is the right of every student, and it has been affirmed specifically for linguistic minority students in the Lau and subsequent federal court decisions. That is what this report is concerned about.

This concern has several sources. One is simply the growth of linguistic minority population in our schools; in the face of a sharp decline in White enrollment over the past decade, and generally level Black enrollment (itself concealing an increase in the number of Haitian and Cape Verdean students), the numbers of Hispanic and Asian students have increased rapidly.

There were 27,750 Hispanic students in 1974 (the first year when the state racial census requested this information), compared with 44,493 in 1985, for an increase of 60%. The one-year increase from 1984 to 1985 is 2,884, or 7%. Asian enrollment, though smaller, has increased even more dramatically, from 5,937 in 1974 to 15,901 in 1984 and 18,014 in 1985, for a total increase of 203% and a one-year increase of 13%. By contrast, White enrollment has declined from 1,101,033 in 1974 to 725,578 in 1985, or -34%.

Related to this population increase is a change in the demographic profile of linguistic minority students. A decade ago newly-arrived Hispanic families tended to have young children, heavily concentrated in the elementary grades; those children have grown up through the grades, so that now nearly 5% of the ninth graders in public schools are Hispanic, compared with 6% in grades 4-6 and 6.7% in grade 1. At the 12th grade, however, only 2.8% of the students are Hispanic. It is at the secondary level that the adequacy of our educational arrangements is found wanting by a dramatic rate of educational failure and school-leaving. So long as most Hispanic students were in the elementary grades it was possible to be somewhat complacent about the efforts that the public schools were making on their behalf; as they reach--and leave--high school we must judge those efforts by the results.

This leads to a third source of concern, discussed in more detail below: several studies indicate that linguistic minority--and especially Hispanic--students are not deriving the benefits from our educational programs that their parents have a right to expect. Recent national studies show that this is not a problem limited to Massachusetts, but we believe that Massachusetts should be finding the way to a just and effective solution, as it has to similarly difficult challenges such as special education and desegregation.

As the number of refugees in Massachusetts has increased since the end of the Vietnam War, Maureen Wark of this Bureau has served as the Department's liaison to the various groups working to meet the needs of Southeast Asian and other newly-arrived students. Our 1985 Report noted the extreme difficulty of meeting these needs in Lowell and other urban systems. Although the focus of the discussion that follows will be on the needs of linguistic minority students who have been in our schools for a number of years and are experiencing difficulties, the recommendations are intended to assure that we do a more effective job in serving the new language groups that are only now entering our schools.

Finally, the development of desegregation plans in an increasing number of school systems whose "minority" students are predominantly Hispanic and Asian rather than Black has forced the Bureau's attention to the continuing educational issues in newly-desegregated schools. Nearly 80% of the Hispanic students in Massachusetts attend schools that benefit from Chapter 636 (state desegregation) funds. Several systems--Holyoke, Springfield, Worcester-which have implemented elementary desegregation are now directing their efforts and Chapter 636 funds to strengthening secondary education for Hispanic students. This report draws heavily upon what these and other Massachusetts urban school systems have learned from experience.

WHO ARE "LINGUISTIC MINORITY" STUDENTS?

In general, linguistic minority students are those who come under the protection of the language in Chapter 622, the Massachusetts Equal Educational Opportunity Law, which forbids discrimination on the basis of "national origin." In practical terms we have from the start interpreted this to mean students who are vulnerable to discrimination or unequal opportunity because of their foreign birth, or that of their parents, or the language spoken in their home.

There is no exact way of determining the numbers of such students in the public school population statewide. The annual school census asks for a report on "students whose first language is not English," and 64,960 such students were reported in October 1985 (out of a total public school enrollment of 845,430).

Language	Number	% of Total in State
Spanish	31,022	48%
Portuguese	12,646	19%
Chinese	4,150	6%
French & Creole	2,481	4%
Khmer	2,477	4%
Vietnamese	2,078	3%
Cape Verdean	1,981	3%
Italian	1,820	3%
Greek	1,657	3%
Lao	723	1%

It is important to note that this category is not identical with that of students entitled to bilingual education. The

annual census also asks for the number of "students unable to perform ordinary classwork in English." This is a narrower category, and it is important to note that the proportion of students of a language group who are limited in their proficiency in English varies widely.

Language	Limited English	% of Total in State
Spanish	14,174	56%
Portuguese	2,547	10%
Khmer	1,779	7%
Chinese	1,522	6%
French & Creole	1,123	4%
Cape Verdean	973	4%
Vietnamese	894	4%
Italian	389	2%
Greek	375	1%
Lao	373	1%

The proportion of students in each language group who are "unable to perform ordinary classwork in English" reflects a variety of factors, including the recentness of immigration and the extent of assimilation. Italian immigrants, for example, are able to assimilate into an Italian-American community where English is used by preference; undoubtedly this promotes the rapid learning of English without "culture-shock".

Language	Proportion Limited English-speaking
Khmer	72%
Lao	52%
Cape Verdean	49%
Spanish	46%
French & Creole	45%
Vietnamese	43%
All language groups	39%
Chinese	37%
Greek	23%
Italian	21%
Portuguese	20%

Three sub-groups may be identified on the basis of this measure of assimilation. First are the recent refugees from Southeast Asia, those who speak Khmer, Lao, Vietnamese,

Hmong or other languages. We have recently become aware of around thirty students in Boston from Laos who speak Kmhmu, a language that only recently was given a written form. To these must be added those "ethnic Chinese" who are among the refugees from Vietnam.

The number of Khmer-speaking students from Cambodia has been increasing dramatically, from 1121 in 1983 to 2477 two years later, for an increase of 121% in this short period. One encouraging sign is that the proportion "unable to perform ordinary classwork in English" has dropped in that time from 85% to 72%.

The number of Lao-speaking students increased more gradually, from 640 to 723, or 13%, with the "limited English-proficient" proportion dropping from 60% to 52%. The number of Vietnamese-speaking increased from 1601 to 2078, or 30%, but the number "unable to perform ordinary classwork in English" actually declined by 6%, and the proportion from 59% to 43%!

For these victims of war, a dangerous flight, and refugee camps our bilingual programs have offered a welcome and support that goes beyond language development. Many of the students and their families are concerned to make the transition to English as quickly as possible, especially for those who are of secondary-school age but, as a result of circumstances, have received little formal schooling. Although a high proportion continue to need language programs, the figures cited above indicate a rapid rate of assimilation.

A separate section of this Report, by Maureen Wark, discusses current issues affecting these refugee students, including projects funded by the Bureau in Lowell and Revere.

A second sub-group consists of the Italian, Greek and Portuguese-speaking students whose families have come to Massachusetts seeking economic opportunities and to join well-established communities resulting from the immigration of the period 1880-1914. The number of such students who are "unable to perform ordinary classwork in English" has dropped, since 1980, by 52% among Italians, 31% among Portuguese, and 17% among Greeks.

Bilingual education serves a transitional function for these students, though many may remain in bilingual programs after achieving proficiency in English for the sake of language and cultural maintenance--and, in Boston, perhaps to avoid desegregation. There do not appear to be serious equity issues involving this group of students.

The Boston Public Schools have pointed with pride to the number of seniors graduating from bilingual programs who intend to go on to higher education. In June 1984 there were 209 such students, of whom 48 or 23% were Hispanic, though Hispanic students represented 53% of the enrollment in the bilingual program. Stated another way, graduating seniors intending to go on to higher education represented 1.2% of the Hispanic enrollment in the Boston bilingual program, but 7.5% of the Italian enrollment and 7% of the Vietnamese enrollment. Averaging the figures together could create the impression that we are serving all linguistic minority students well, but closer analysis shows an equity issue for Hispanic but not for Italian or Vietnamese students.

The third group consists of Cape Verdean, Haitian and Hispanic students for whom race adds a complicating factor, and many of whose families have come not so much seeking opportunities as fleeing economic hardship. For these students, whose families may encounter discrimination in housing and employment, our education efforts are much less successful.

The Cape Verdean-speaking enrollment has increased by 62% since 1980, and by 26% since 1983, but the proportion "unable to perform ordinary classwork in English" has dropped from 60% to 49% since 1980.

We can only approximate the Haitian enrollment, by combining those students reported as speaking Creole and those reported as speaking French, while recognizing that the latter includes some non-Haitian students. This combined figure has increased by 77% since 1980, with the proportion "unable to perform ordinary classwork in English climbing from 32% to 45%. It seems likely that the earlier figure reflects a much higher proportion of non-Haitian students than does the latter. The number of "limited English-proficient" students has jumped by 43% in the last two years.

The number of students whose first language is Spanish has increased by 24% since 1980; this reflects an increase of more than six thousand students. As we will see below, there is a larger ethnic category of "Hispanic" students; with no other group are we able to correlate the ethnic and language data.

To an extent impossible to determine precisely there are political as well as "economic refugees" among these

groups; for example, the Hispanic community in Massachusetts includes families or their descendants who left their native lands in opposition to Batista and to Castro, to Allende and to Pinochet, to the present governments of El Salvador and Nicaragua. The great majority, however, are here for economic reasons, and for many this has meant taking the least rewarding jobs and living in the most dilapidated housing; it is their children, by and large, who are having the most difficulty in school.

The focus of this discussion, then, will be upon those linguistic minority students--Cape Verdean, Haitian, and Hispanic--for whom we have not managed to provide equal educational opportunity. Most attention will be devoted to Hispanic students, simply because far more information is available about their needs.

Two qualifications must be stated here: natives of Puerto Rico are of course citizens by right, and not immigrants; there are many students of each of the groups discussed who are outstandingly successful in school, and exhibit none of the problems discussed. No attempt will be made to add these qualifications at every point in the discussion when they might be appropriate.

Better information is available for Hispanic students than for the other groups because this is also a racial/ethnic group reported on the racial census and on the Basic Skills Assessment. There are currently 44,493 Hispanic students (as noted above), of whom 31,022 (70%) speak Spanish as their primary language and 14,174 (32%) are unable to perform ordinary classwork in English. In other words, less than one third of the Hispanic students in Massachusetts are entitled to bilingual education under state law; this should be kept in mind in the discussion with follows.

"Asian" students form another racial/ethnic category, one that includes students of Chinese ancestry who may be third or fourth generation Bostonians and newly arrived Khmer, Lao and Vietnamese-speaking refugees. Of 18,014 Asian students in public schools, 9,428 (52%) speak a language other than English as their primary language, and 4,568 (25%) are "unable to perform ordinary classwork in English."

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Responding to the Post-Civil War Immigration

The problems that we face today were of concern to the Board of Education during the first great period of immigration to Massachusetts of families whose first language was not English, in the latter part of the nineteenth century. In its 1893 Annual Report the Board noted that state law required that all children be "instructed in the English language," but that a number of parochial schools provided instruction in the native languages of their parishioners. "Language is the great unifier," the Board observed, "Separate languages mean separate historical training, separate or diverse traditions, and both social and sectional clashings. Without a common language we cannot become a nation. Without the execution of our school laws we cannot attain to a common language ..."

In 1914 the Massachusetts Commission on Immigration issued its report on current efforts to meet the educational and other needs of the newcomers. The Commission had visited 39 parochial schools in nineteen communities which taught in a language other than English, and reported that "the almost universal rule in these schools is to teach in English for half a day, and in Polish, Italian, Portuguese, French or Greek for half a day. These bilingual schools, of which there are over 90 in Massachusetts, present a problem of much difficulty, involving both religious and national motives deeply rooted in the heart and mind of the foreign-speaking peoples, and entitled to sympathetic recognition by the entire community. . . That the knowledge of a second language has cultural advantages is beyond dispute, and should be encouraged . . [but for the children] the far more practical and far more difficult problem of bread-winning is the one to which . . . they will be forced to devote their unremitting attention. It is therefore of vital importance to them, as well as to the State, that they should be fitted in the best possible manner for this . . . in the secular instruction in these schools, the study of English should be given first place, and . . . all studies, except religion and the native language of the children, should be conducted in the English language."

The Commission also discussed the programs provided by public schools. "Twenty-six cities and towns in the State report that 'steamer' classes are provided for those children who are above the primary age when they arrive. . . Where excellent methods are used and proper provision is made for the separate instruction of those who have had

little schooling in Europe and of those who have had much, English is learned in an incredibly short time." To be deplored, however, was the practice in some schools where "immigrant children are placed in a 'special' class with the backward and subnormal children for whom quite different methods are needed, and a grave injustice is thus done to both groups."

What we would now call "multi-cultural education" was a part of the program in 1914. The Commission noted that "it was long ago recognized that all teaching must be carefully adapted to background of each child's life. To know this background the teachers must study the modifications of the old-world customs and traditions as they are found in Boston, New Bedford and Springfield. They must know the parents as well as the children; their past as well as their present. . . we need very carefully worked out plans for teaching respect for the virtues that these immigrant parents possess."

"The large number of these children warrants the most careful working out of a theory of how the schools can 'educate' the immigrant children along American lines and at the same time not destroy the traditions around which their whole family life is built. . . in Fall River the fathers of a few more, and in Boston of a few less, than one-third of all the public-school children came from non-English speaking countries. Failure to take into consideration, in the planning of the work and play of these children, the history of these immigrant people and their life and work in America means a needlessly imperfect education for all such children."

These extensive quotations from a state report in 1914 serve as a reminder that concern for educational equity and sensitivity to cultural differences are not a discovery on which we can congratulate ourselves; leaders of the "Progressive Era" saw at least as clearly as we do what justice and democratic pluralism require.

After World War I--at the close of the most extraordinary period of trans-oceanic voluntary migration in history--Commissioner of Education Payson Smith noted that "approximately 350,000 of the citizens and prospective citizens of the State are unable to make use of the common medium of communication of the people," and called for more vigorous and systematic State leadership. "All of the cities and towns working together in a State program for the accomplishment of results such as the enlightened public opinion of a progressive State will increasingly demand is the imperative need of the Commonwealth."

Notable local efforts occurred in this period, despite the climate of xenophobia that was prevalent in Massachusetts, as elsewhere. Boston Superintendent Frank V. Thompson (as noted in our Report last year) gave national leadership on the humane and effective education of the children of immigrants. The Oliver School in Lawrence was cited for an "education in citizenship" which made the school itself a model of responsible decision-making by students, with projects for each grade, pre-figuring the City Magnet School in Lowell.

The "New" Linguistic Minority Students

The sharp restrictions on immigration imposed by Congress in 1924 and again in 1952 (over President Truman's veto) had a direct impact on the agenda of Massachusetts schools and of the Board: the needs of linguistic minority students were no longer a major issue. Even when the first large-scale migration of American citizens speaking a language other than English, from Puerto Rico, began after World War II, relatively few came to Massachusetts. In 1960 there were 612,574 Puerto Ricans in New York City, but only 995 in Boston; by 1970 there were 817,712 in New York City and 7,335 in Boston, with 24,561 in all of Massachusetts.

Despite this relatively small population (to which should be added a thousand or more Cubans), Massachusetts took an early lead in seeking to meet the needs of Hispanic children. Opinion was shocked to learn, in 1972, that the rate of poverty among Puerto Ricans in Boston was higher than that in any other major mainland city. The "scandal" of hundreds of Hispanic children not attending school was uncovered by Sister Francis Georgia Vicente and other community workers, while studies by Dr. Mona Hull and other psychologists revealed that many Hispanic students of normal intelligence were being assigned to "special classes" in the public schools. At the same time, the Hispanic Office for Planning and Evaluation (HOPE) and local anti-poverty agencies issued reports noting the many and complex needs of Hispanic youth.

Meanwhile, the liberalization of immigration restrictions in 1965 led to an increasing population of Chinese, Portuguese, Greek and other foreign-born children in the schools. Many of them arrived after a number of years of schooling in their native lands, but with little or no English. In 1971 the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity undertook the

first survey of the number of students speaking a language other than English, and employed Sister Francis Georgia as "Advocate for Linguistic Minorities," to begin to press for effective state and local policies to meet their needs.

As a Puerto Rican parent told the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights in the early seventies, his children were "practically wasting their time because they are not learning anything. . . . What good does it do to sit there in front of the teacher and just look at her face? . . They don't learn anything because they don't understand what she is saying." A 1970 study reported that in New England 25% of the Hispanic students had been held back at least three grades in school, and 50% at least two grades, while only 12% were in the correct grade for their age.

In response to such problems nationwide, the U. S. Office for Civil Rights in 1970 notified school districts with more than 5% "national origin-minority group children" that, "Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes [them] from effective participation in the educational program . ., the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students. Such programs "must be designed to meet such language skill needs as soon as possible and must not operate as an educational dead-end or permanent track."

Massachusetts adopted the first state law in the nation to seek to address language-learning in a comprehensive way, the Transitional Bilingual Education Act of 1971. This statute calls for a determination, by local school committees, of which students are "incapable of performing ordinary classwork in English," and their placement in a program of transitional bilingual education "for a period of three years or until such time as he achieves a level of English language skills which will enable him to perform successfully in classes in which instruction is given only in English, whichever shall first occur." Under certain conditions individual children may remain longer than three years.

The statute also defines, at least in general terms, the pedagogy that local school systems are required to employ with students who require bilingual programs, in contrast with the general tendency of Massachusetts educational legislation.

This law, the Board's regulations and continuing support, and the efforts of local and state administrators have led

to the development of what is now a large-scale enterprise of bilingual education in Massachusetts. Some 20,000 students and nearly 1,200 teachers are enagaged in this enterprise, which combines language instruction with activities designed to develop an appreciation of cultural heritage. Visits to several hundred bilingual classrooms have made me appreciative of their caring and lively atmosphere.

Unfortunately, those who developed the 1971 legislation--and I share in this indictment--took too narrow a view of what would be required to extend full equal educational opportunity to linguistic minority students. For a time we tended to assume that the only issue remaining was to assure that bilingual programs were fully implemented. By the mid-seventies it was becoming apparent that attention was needed at the points where bilingual education intersected with special and vocational education, and by 1980 we were pointing out that Hispanic and other students who had completed bilingual programs or whose only language was English were experiencing unacceptably-high rates of academic failure.

In brief, bilingual education could not be, by itself , a sufficient vehicle to meet all of the needs of linguistic minority students, and attention must be given to the extent to which bilingual education programs prepare students for the challenges that they will encounter as they seek to take advantage of the opportunities available in secondary and higher education. Two recent studies--one of them as yet incomplete--focus attention on these issues.

INDICATORS OF OUR FAILURE

The Basic Skills Assessment

Under the Board of Education's Basic Skills Improvement Policy , an annual assessment is made of the number and proportion of students who meet minimum standards in the basic skills. Performance is measured in the early elementary grades (K-3), later elementary grades (4-6), and secondary grades (7-12). School systems determine what evaluation instruments will be used, and set the "minimum standard" for each skill; they also may exempt certain students from the program.

This last provision has the effect that the statewide assessment excludes a substantial proportion of the Hispanic

enrollment of the Commonwealth, those considered, by local school officials, incapable of performing ordinary classwork in English. In 1984-85, the following proportions of white and Hispanic students were exempted from the reading assessment:

	White	Hispanic
K-3	5%	38%
4-6	5%	36%
7-12	6%	35%

In other words, a pre-selection has eliminated more than one third of the Hispanic students, those who have not been "mainstreamed," from the assessment; we simply do not know how well they are doing.

Urban educators consulted during the preparation of this report singled out again and again the lack of solid achievement data as a serious hinderance to their efforts; we simply don't know enough, they said, about where we are doing a good job and where we need to improve. No data are available that would allow a judgment to be made as to the statewide achievement levels of students who remain in bilingual programs, or to compare achievement (in native language and in English) among school systems and schools. As the Hispanic Office of Planning and Evaluation put it in its 1984 report, **Hispanic Youth in Boston: In Search of Opportunities and Accountability**, "the basis for such an evaluation, even ten years after implementation [of bilingual programs], has yet to be laid."

Among those who were included in the assessment, Hispanic students had the highest failure rate. At the early elementary grades in 1984-85, the failure rates in reading (in English) were:

White	6% failed to meet minimum
Other (mostly Asian)	4%
Black	11%
Hispanic	16%

Performance was much more closely clustered in mathematics:

White	6% failed to meet minimum
Other	4%
Black	10%
Hispanic	12%

These early elementary results define the challenge faced by our schools, in part as a result of insufficient attention to early childhood programs for children who require language development support. It has been argued, in an attempt to reduce the significance of such results, that social class accounts for a large part of the failure rate among both Black and Hispanic students, and it would be foolish to deny a connection that has been so extensively demonstrated in the research. It has also been argued that the tests are "culturally biased," a charge which was more accurate a decade ago than today. From an equity perspective, however, the issue is not to find excuses but to define the problem and set about developing solutions. The substantial lag of "regular program" Hispanic students in these assessments is consistent across the Commonwealth, whatever measure is used by the various school systems, and it defines a problem which we have no right to ignore.

The later elementary (grades 4-6) results, to an even greater extent, are ones for which the education we provide must take a substantial responsibility. The great majority of Hispanic students in Massachusetts enter our schools (though they may transfer from one school system to another) in kindergarten or first grade, and we provide their entire formal education. The fact that the proportion who achieve the minimum standard on the basic skills actually declines in the upper elementary grades, when most have been enrolled for four or more years in a regular or bilingual class, is a serious indictment of our efforts and a challenge to make a much more concerted--and intelligent--effort to serve them.

The failure rates in upper elementary reading in 1984-85 were:

White	7% failed to meet minimum
Other	11%
Black	15%
Hispanic	22%

This was up from a 30% failure rate for Hispanic students in 1983-84, encouraging progress but still a very bleak picture.

There was a disproportionate falling-off in mathematics achievement as well:

White	8% failed to meet minimum
Other	6%
Black	23%
Hispanic	20%

Comparison of these "spreads" shows that the performance of Hispanic students by comparison with Black students, who tend to share with them social class and urban characteristics, is particularly low in reading. This is not startling, of course, but it should warn us against against explanations that attribute lack of achievement exclusively to social class factors. Hispanic students in the Commonwealth face a "double jeopardy" to which both class and language contribute, and they require very specific language development assistance that our present efforts are not providing to a sufficient extent. To face this fact is not "blaming the victim"; it is simple realism.

At the secondary level Hispanic students improve slightly in reading but fall considerably in mathematics performance. In reading:

White	9% failed to meet minimum
Other	16%
Black	20%
Hispanic	26%

By grades 7-12 most Hispanic students who took part in bilingual programs initially should have received a solid grounding in "academic language skills" and be performing at or above grade norms, according to researchers who support bilingual education. There are undoubtedly many for whom this has been true, in the years since 1972 when the Massachusetts Transitional Bilingual Law went into effect. Unfortunately, the performance of Hispanic students in general continues to lag behind that of other students, even after we have had the opportunity to educate them for eight or ten years! Clearly we are not doing enough, or we are not doing the right things to develop their native abilities.

The fact that the performance of "Other" (mostly Asian) students drops in reading at the secondary level supports the view that language development support should be provided on an on-going basis, well past the point of transition to a "mainstream" class for those students who are initially assigned to bilingual classes, and from the start for those who are not.

A serious gap in mathematics achievement opens up at the secondary level:

White	10% failed to meet minimum
Other	8%
Black	22%
Hispanic	24%

The statewide assessment program also requires school systems to report the proportion of students who have not achieved the minimum standards by the end of either the eleventh or twelfth grade (at the choice of the system). At first appearance the results for Hispanic students are much more encouraging on this measure.

For example, in the 1983-84 reading results:

White	1% failed to meet minimum
Other	6%
Black	8%
Hispanic	8%

Any satisfaction that we might derive from this result is limited by the fact that the Hispanic students who remain in high school for this "final evaluation" are the survivors of a catastrophic drop-out rate. While the statewide public school enrollment of White students in the 12th grade in October 1985 was 88.5% of that in the 9th grade, Hispanic 12th grade enrollment represented less than 48% of Hispanic 9th grade enrollment. Concretely, there were 3,721 Hispanic students in the 9th grade and 1,782 in the 12th.

In brief, the results of the statewide basic skills assessment indicate a serious failure to meet the educational needs of Hispanic students and to encourage the full development of their native abilities. This is especially the case at the critical upper-elementary level, where the gap between White and Hispanic students in reading has actually widened since 1980-81. These are students whose entire education, in most cases, has been in Massachusetts schools . . . .

The Boston Monitoring Report

Perhaps the most helpful way of assessing the causes of academic failure--and finding remedies--is to take a "cohort" of students, all of a particular group rather

than simply those for whom the academic experience has been unsuccessful, and attempt to determine whether there are systematic differences between the educational services provided to those who succeed and those who fail. Such a study is going on at present.

Last June, in a special report ordered by the Federal District Court in the context of desegregation monitoring, the Board of Education raised some questions about students who appear to remain for excessive periods of time (six or more years) in bilingual programs in Boston. Either these students are not making the progress in the mastery of English-language skills intended by the Transitional Bilingual Law and Regulations, or they are not being appropriately "transitioned" upon mastery of those skills. The Board took note of two potential equity issues: denial of an effective transitional program of teaching English (as required by the Supreme Court's Lau decision as well as by state law) and racial segregation not necessitated by educational considerations. The available data did not permit conclusions, but the Board made a commitment to follow-up study and to action under its own statutory authority, if necessary. An in-depth review by the Regional Education Center has been under way since the summer to seek the reasons for this long-term retention in a separate program.

Meanwhile, this Bureau has begun to meet another part of the Board's commitment, to conduct a longitudinal study of a "cohort" of linguistic minority students over a number of years. The Boston Public Schools provided information on every Hispanic and Asian student who entered the system in 1980-81, with the status of that student in 1985-86. The data included test scores, language assessments, and school, program and grade placements in the original and most-recent year.

While this analysis is far from complete, an initial count demonstrates that long-term retention in a bilingual program is indeed the rule rather than the exception for Hispanic students. This is especially true of those who have been enrolled in the Boston schools for their entire education. Thus, of 676 Hispanic students who entered the system in kindergarten or grade 1 in 1980-81 and were assigned to a bilingual program, 461 or 68% were reported to be still in a bilingual program in 1985-86, their sixth year in the system. By contrast, of 205 Chinese, Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian students who were assigned to a bilingual program in 1980-81, only 39 or 19% were reported to be still in a bilingual program in 1985-86. [These figures do not include students no longer in the system.]

Hispanic students who entered the system after some years of schooling elsewhere were more likely to have been "mainstreamed". For example, of 264 students who entered in the third grade, 143 or 46% remained in bilingual programs in the sixth year.

Other Studies

The 1984 report by the Hispanic Office of Planning and Evaluation, mentioned above, notes that 18.5% of white Massachusetts residents aged 18 to 24, but 59.1% of Hispanics, had no high school diploma in 1980.

The same report notes that 8.3% of White youth aged 16 and 17 were not in school, compared with 22.2% of Hispanic youth.

Also in 1984, the National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics found that 40% of Hispanic students nationwide who leave school do so before entering high school, and that few Hispanics who drop out ever return to school.

Comparing the different sub-groups within the Hispanic population, the Commission found a median family income of $17,500 per year for Cubans, $15,200 for Mexican Americans, $15,500 for other Hispanics, and $9,900 for Puerto Ricans. Massachusetts was reported to have 6,617 Cuban residents in 1980, 7,385 Mexican American residents, 50,591 "other Hispanic" residents, and 76,450 Puerto Rican residents. Nationwide, the Puerto Rican population was the youngest of the Hispanic groups.

Ten years ago the United States Commission on Civil Rights issued a report entitled: **Puerto Ricans in the Continental United States: An Uncertain Future.** That future has in part arrived, and it is fair to say that many of the more dire predictions of the Commission have been realised. Despite much individual achievement, we have not found ways to overcome the employment and income problems faced by Puerto Rican migrants and by immigrants from Central America, and we have not provided an effective education to their children. Our data is much less adequate on Cape Verdean and Haitian students, who are generally reported among Black students without further distinction, but there is at least scattered evidence that they face many of the same problems.

The focus of this report is not on "bilingual education" as such, but on the broader question of our obligations, as educators, to the linguistic minority students who represent a steadily-growing proportion of our public school enrollment, and especially to those for whom their educational experiences in Massachusetts are not a success. It starts from the premise that the instructional strategy of "bilingual education," while of tremendous interest and value, is only one part of what must be a comprehensive effort, and that a failure to recognize this fact does an injustice to students and to bilingual program staff.

What would be the elements of a comprehensive effort to meet the educational needs of linguistic minority students?

A COMPREHENSIVE EFFORT

In Common with Other Students

First of all, of course, we must provide those qualities essential to good education for any student: safe, friendly schools with an atmosphere conducive to learning; teachers who believe that every student can learn; principals who serve as education leaders and set high expectations for themselves and for every member of the school community; curriculum that reflects the diversity of our society and provides an appropriate sequence of challenges to learn; continual monitoring of student needs which cannot be met within the ordinary course of instruction, and special arrangements to meet these needs; fair and consistent discipline; exposure to the great ideas and the historical events which have shaped our nation, and to the challenges which we face today; regular assessment of academic progress with remedial help to assure that no student falls too far behind; opportunities to develop special gifts and interests . . .

The list could go on, and could include the sensitivity that every member of the staff should have to the emotional needs many students bring with them to school, and the need of every student to be treated with respect; it could include the education in character that has always been a central purpose of schooling. It certainly would have to include the expectation that every student can learn, and that linguistic minority students have capacities equal to those of students whose only language is English.

Such general qualities of good schooling should be obvious, but unfortunately they may be missing for linguistic minority students, even those in schools that provide them adequately for others. For example, many principals act as though their educational responsibilities did not extend to bilingual classes, or to the relation between those classes and the rest of the school. Facilities may be inadequate--basements, coat rooms--or may segregate students in bilingual classes from their age-mates.

And if the conditions under which bilingual education is provided are often inadequate, our years of monitoring urban schools suggest that the situation of those linguistic minority students who are not in bilingual programs may be far worse. Special educational needs or gifts may go unrecognized because of their limitations in English (even if it is their "primary language"). Their frequently passive behavior makes it tempting for fellow-students to bully them and for staff to consign them to "slow average" groups or classes; remedial strategies may be used that are inappropriate for students for whom on-going linguistic development is the major need. Cultural signals are frequently misinterpreted on both sides.

Efforts to meet the needs of linguistic minority students must take care at very least to meet the standards that may be taken for granted for other students. This is not enough. As is often the case, identical treatment does not translate into real equity. Equity requires an effective education for each student, based upon unique qualities but also upon qualities that groups of students may share. Linguistic minority students have educational and developmental needs that require special attention. They also have strengths and potentialities, because of their double exposure to language and culture, that deserve encouragement.

TEN ELEMENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

1. Individual Educational Programs

The essential starting point should be a recognition that linguistic minority students vary in their needs even more widely than do other students, because of their different degrees of language acquisition in two languages (or more, in the case of many Cape Verdean or Haitian students). Their educational program should not be prescribed by the single test of language

proficiency. No single educational approach can meet the needs of all; more even than native English-speakers, they need a program that takes full account of their aptitudes and--something entirely different--of their readiness for mastery of the skills that they will need in English.

This is why, by the way, it is legitimate to take a flexible approach toward the three year transitional program anticipated by our state bilingual law. Some students are ready for mainstreaming (though they should have continuing support) in one or two years, while others may require four or five. A "lockstep" approach is inappropriate. The emphasis of Chapter 71A is on individual competency.

To assure that the needs of students who differ so greatly are met, an individual educational program should be developed for every student for whom the primary language spoken at home is not English, whether or not the student is assigned to a bilingual program. Holyoke refers to this as a "language and cognitive profile." At the time of the initial assessment of language dominance (when a student enters the system) a process should begin that will be periodically up-dated until the student graduates or leaves the system.

In ordinary practice, such assessments are an integral part of a "Lau Plan" for students enrolled in bilingual programs. What is proposed here goes farther: it would, for example, include all Hispanic students, not just the 32% statewide who are eligible for bilingual education, in a process of on-going monitoring of educational progress. A step in that direction is the current practice, in Worcester, of providing an annual update on academic performance of former bilingual program students to the program director. What is here proposed would require a more active collaboration of language development specialists and those responsible for education in general, and would include students never enrolled in a bilingual program.

There are several critical points at which such an individual program--including, of course, an assessment of academic strengths and weaknesses--should without fail be updated. One, as noted, is upon first entry to the school system. A second is toward the end of the three year period in a bilingual program, for those who are initially assigned to one and are not mainstreamed

earlier; this should be automatic, whether or not the student is ready to exit the program. A third, which could occur earlier or later than the second, is when the student is ready for mainstreaming, to determine what on-going language development support he or she will need.

The fourth point at which assessment and planning should without fail occur (it could of course coincide with one of the others) is when the student is ready to enter high school, and should assure participation in a course of study that will be sufficiently challenging, together with language development support as needed. The student should be a major participant in this stage of planning. Too many Hispanic students end up in a "low general" course of study because of language difficulties that bear little relation to their real abilities.

One of the recommendations of the National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, in 1984, was that "the English proficiency of all students should be formally assessed before they go to high school. A pre-high school summer term and an intensive freshman-year supplementary program should be provided for students who are deficient in the use of English." This is discussed further, below, in point #5.

Simply assigning a student into a bilingual program at one point and out of that program a few years later is not adequate. Mastering a second language--which may also involve a second culture--is a complex and subtle learning process, and it should be an on-going responsibility of the school system, not limited to the years that a student may spend in a separate class.

Here I must add a disclaimer that should not be necessary. By using an approach that has proved its value in special education, I am not suggesting that speaking a language other than English is somehow a "handicapping condition," any more than we do so when using the term "mainstreaming." Last year I was accused of insulting Hispanic students by referring to full-time bilingual programs (without partial mainstreaming) as "substantially separate." These are simply descriptive terms, and it seems fruitless to add to the burden of educational jargon by coining new ones. Some linguistic minority students do have "special needs," of course, but I am not referring to them in particular.

2. **Continuity of Study for "Transferring" Students**

Students who have completed several years of formal schooling in another language (for example, in Puerto Rico or in a foreign country) should be allowed to continue their studies in that language while mastering English. Students who enter our schools in the third grade should not be mainstreamed to a regular class three years later with only a second grade knowledge of mathematics!

It was the needs of such students, more than of any other group, that were cited by advocates of passage of the Massachusetts Transitional Bilingual Education Act, in 1971, and the statute defined a TBE program as including instruction "in all those courses which a child is required by law to receive and which are required by the child's school committee which shall be given in the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability who are enrolled in the program and also in English."

This requires a curriculum in the first language that closely parallels that which students in regular classes in the same school system are following. Without careful attention to parallel progress, students who are mainstreamed are very likely to run into academic difficulties.

3. **Early Childhood Programs**

As the Commonwealth implements its commitment to early childhood education, it is essential that programs prepare linguistic minority children for success in school. Part of this task involves social development, which it seems most appropriate to promote in the language spoken at home, for example in Spanish or Khmer. The child will make the transition to the structured environment of a classroom, and will learn to participate in group activities, to answer and ask questions, and to feel that sense of safety which is essential to further success if she is in contact with adults who speak the "mother tongue" and are in ready communication with the home. This seems a basic right that should be addressed as programs are implemented; this will in turn require the identification and training of a large number of Hispanic and Asian early childhood educators.

There is disagreement among educators and researchers as to how early use of English should be introduced. Some would postpone it for several years to avoid confusion in the cognitive and linguistic development of the children; others believe that a carefully-structured program, as at the highly-regarded Escuelita Agueybana in Boston, can take advantage of the almost unlimited learning potential of young children to give them a sound basis in both languages and so foster true bilingualism. There was general agreement among educators consulted in the preparation of this report that early childhood programs for linguistic minority students must in any event avoid stunting their development by an exclusive reliance upon English.

In Springfield, the public schools reach out to pre-early childhood education children through their "Toddlers Program," which works with mothers of young children in their homes. This reflects a growing determination, on the part of the desegregating school systems in Massachusetts, to enlist parents in the stimulation and education of their children. Urban educators in Massachusetts are rejecting the social determinism that says that the school has to do everything, that poor parents, parents who may not speak English, parents who may be illiterate are not able to contribute to the development of the capacities of their children. Given the evidence that cognitive and linguistic development occur very early, our efforts should not be limited to what can take place within schoolhouses.

4. Transitional Bilingual Education

Massachusetts law makes wise provision for a three year period during which limited English-speaking students are provided a "compensatory program of transitional bilingual education" to "meet the needs of these children and facilitate their integration into the regular public school curriculum" [Section 1. Declaration of Policy].

The Board of Education, in its Regulations for implementation of this statute, has stated as the goal that

> Transitional Bilingual Education programs shall be designed and conducted so that

> students enrolled in such programs can achieve skills in aural comprehension, speaking, reading and writing of English sufficient to perform ordinary classwork in English within the three-year transitional period. [Reg. 23]

The Legislature included in the statute itself a requirement of accountability for results, specifying that

> An examination in the oral comprehension, speaking, reading and writing of English, as prescribed by the [State Department of Education], shall be administered annually to all children of limited English-speaking ability enrolled and participating in a program in transitional bilingual education. [Ch. 71A, sec.2]

It is of course essential that school systems assess the effectiveness with which their programs meet the stated objective, and modify any aspects that seem to get in the way of doing so. The current in-depth study of the Boston program should provide valuable clues as to why many students do not make the intended transition.

The rationale for teaching in the language of the home as part of the process of learning English is based upon the contention of some respected researchers that this will eventually result in higher-order thinking skills, and eventually proficiency in the second language. It is an attempt to avoid the tragedy of youth at the margins of two cultures, who have "no native language". Certainly experience suggests that individuals who have mastered any language thoroughly find it easier to become proficient in a second or third than those who have only the limited vocabulary and syntax of many working-class homes. By building on the most familiar language, these researchers and advocates believe, a competence can be developed that will transfer relatively easily to English.

While research evidence for this pedagogical model is conflicting and hotly disputed, there is no need to accept it in order to recognize the wisdom of providing a supportive environment for those linguistic minority students who come to school with little proficiency in English, within which they can continue learning in their native language while acquiring the basis for

mastery of English. The National Commission cited above comments that "Hispanic parents are staunch supporters of solid English instruction. What they do object to are instructional approaches to learning English that deprive their children of Spanish, which often is the language of communication in their families. Parents fear that they will not be able to guide their youth and pass on their values."

This must not lead to neglect of teaching English, of course. "A complaint the Commission heard frequently was that the schools have not been effective in teaching English, and that progress in improving English language teaching methods has been slow." Lack of effective teaching of English as a Second Language is in fact one of the allegations in the class action suit brought on behalf of Hispanic students in Lynn, and a primary finding of our recent Boston monitoring.

While such programs stress the value of the cultural heritage of the participants, they are not intended to promote separatism but rather to facilitate integration into American schooling and American society on the basis of equal worth and equal competence.

5. **Extra Developmental English as Necessary**

Some students, it is clear, are not ready to make the transition to a class in which instruction will be entirely in English after three years. For these students an individual assessment is essential, and a program of developmental English that will give them the capability to benefit from the range of educational opportunities available.

We should not be surprised that some students have such problems. After all, we do a poor job, in most American schools, teaching French or Spanish to native English-speakers! Were it not for an environment--including television--in which English is constantly inculcated, our efforts to teach English might meet with even less success.

We should, at least, learn from the experience of those programs that are most demonstrably successful in teaching foreign languages. A language should be taught by a native-speaker, if possible, and in the language being taught, using a carefully planned and

structured series of exercises. The time devoted to teaching English should be both ample and intensive. There is a place for "structured immersion" within a "bilingual" program!

This is, by the way, the method required by public policy and the consensus of educators in those nations of Western Europe that are seeking to meet the needs of millions of ethnic minority children whose parents came as "guest workers" and whose first language is not that of the host country. In France, Germany, the Netherlands the national language is taught by the "direct method," while supplemental (and optional) classes are offered to maintain the language and culture of the home. A recent government report on this issue in France has called for the abolishment of "educational ghettoes" for immigrant children and their full integration, with supplemental support as needed.

In order to realise this essential program, we will need to increase the supply of fully-trained teachers of English as a Second Language. Too many of those now providing ESL, according to the urban educators with which the draft report was reviewed, were assigned or "bumped" to that responsibility because they had certification at the appropriate grade level, without real training in the techniques of second-language learning.

6. **Continuing Support for All Linguistic Minority Students**

This recommendation is the heart of the program outlined. It is time that we face the fact that language acquisition is not a simple matter, so that a student is "incapable of ordinary classwork in English" one week and capable of it the next! Research has shown that a student may develop an apparent mastery of spoken English or of reading skills, functioning on a level with other third-graders, without having a foundation for the higher order skills that will be required in later grades. This verbal dexterity may lead to the judgment that the student requires no further assistance, thus preparing the way for later failure.

It is in recognition of this fact--either from the research or from hard experience--that the actual practice of bilingual educators across the

Commonwealth has tended to prolong the time that many students spend in separate programs. Students who may perform fairly well on standardized tests may not seem, to the experienced teacher, yet ready to keep up in a regular program without further support.

We have no business posing a stark alternative between a segregated program and integration with no support at all. Real mastery of a language cannot develop without a wide range of opportunities to use it in settings in which there is no alternative, outside of the shelter of a class for language-learning, and such experiences should begin as soon as possible. On the other hand, the degree of proficiency in English that makes such experiences productive is by no means a fully-developed competence, and the student who receives no continuing developmental support may fail to develop the "higher order skills" that are increasingly necessary at the secondary level.

This will require that, in addition to specialists in English as a Second Language, we will need regular classroom teachers with training in principles and techniques of language development. Professor Maria Brisk of Boston University has provided such in-service training for teachers in several Boston schools, to increase their ability to support and challenge students mainstreamed from bilingual programs.

We have heard again and again, from sincere and competent bilingual program teachers, that they hesitate to mainstream even those students whose language proficiency would justify that because of the attitudes of staff and the lack of support in the regular program. In part this reflects the lack of communication between bilingual and regular program teachers in many schools, a problem that must be resolved through joint educational planning with the principal serving as instructional leader for the entire school. To some extent, however, this hesitation is well-founded, and there are some schools where the bilingual program is the only place where Hispanic students are given a fair chance and expected to learn.

To recognize that the hesitation of many bilingual program staff to give up their students may be based, in some cases, on a valid perception of the alternative should not lead us to accept the existence of a "permanent track" for linguistic minority students.

The answer is not to keep the students separate, but to assure that integration is to their benefit. Anything less cheats them educationally while denying their Constitutional right to full integration and participation. It is difficult to see how this can become a reality without substantial involvement by bilingual program staff in planning and then in providing support within the regular educational program, and without solid training and orientation for regular program staff.

7. **Flexible Movement between Integration and Separation**

What would such a system of continuing support look like? One of its characteristics would be flexible movement for individual students between a more challenging environment and a more supportive environment, between classes in which a high standard of performance in English would be demanded, and classes or other educational settings in which the emphasis would be upon strengthening the basis for such performance, among other students facing similar problems and even anxieties.

Nearly twenty years ago I developed, as a consultant for the Boston Model Cities Administration, a plan for education for the growing Hispanic population in Jamaica Plain. The plan called for several "storefront" schools, located in the areas of Hispanic concentration, and serving up to sixty students at a time. Young or newly-arrived Hispanic children would receive, in these homelike settings and in Spanish, their first orientation to schooling. As they developed the skills and confidence to face greater challenges, they would attend a large school part-time and then full-time, returning to the "home base" only for optional language and cultural maintenance, and for counselling and encouragement. The storefront school would remain a permanent reference-point, and an option for a short-term "alternative" assignment for a student who, for whatever reason, needed a period of relief from the pressures of the regular school. It would thus evolve into a multi-age and distinctively Hispanic component of the educational system, with a concentration of support services; it would not pretend to offer a complete alternative course of study. Thus it could not become an "educational dead-end or permanent track."

That proposal met the fate of most Model Cities projects, and I would not seek to revive it now, but the need for centers of continuing support to meet the academic, cultural and emotional needs of Hispanic students continues to seem obvious.

8. **No "Academic Dead-ends"**

If adequate support were available on a flexible basis, through an individualized and frequently-updated educational plan, there would be less tendency to create a separate track for Hispanic students within a "transitional" bilingual program. Unlike "low general" tracks in some schools, the intention of bilingual programs is not to be a "dumping ground" for students not welcome in the mainstream, but unfortunately the result can be very much the same. A program that does not develop the skills--including but not limited to proficiency in English--for successful participation in the mainstream is an "academic dead-end," in the phrase used by the Supreme Court's Lau ruling, resulting in the denial of equal educational opportunity.

As one parent complained to the National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, "Why should I encourage my children to stay in school if they have been in school for two to seven years and have not learned English?"

If mainstreaming without continuing support is an unacceptable option, so is a failure to mainstream students because of low expectations or an insufficiently challenging bilingual program.

9. **Optional Language and Cultural Maintenance**

In order to provide for real educational integration, we need to move from an emphasis on programs to one on entire schools, to the school as the broader context within which both challenge and support can be provided. We should create "bilingual schools" in which two languages and cultures are valued and taught, in which additional language and cultural maintenance in the "minority language" are an option for students

for whom that will be a bridge to their families and their ethnic identity, and in which the mastery of English-language skills is regarded as the key to further education and full participation in American society.

Such schools will need at least as many teachers and other staff with native competence in a language other than English as do separate bilingual programs, but they will need them to work as part of an integrated team with all of the students in the school.

By recognizing that optional language and cultural maintenance is a valid educational goal, we can treat it as one of the choices which, increasingly, we are learning to provide within public education in Massachusetts. [See our January 1986 report, **Family Choice and Public Schools.**] Several cities are now using Chapter 636 funds to support such programs, as well as parallel programs to teach a second language to students whose only language is English. It is essential, however, to avoid confusing such options with the acquisition of proficiency in English, which cannot be optional. Too often the two goals have become confused in public discussions of education for linguistic minority students.

In the Netherlands, which have a reputation for being particularly responsive to the needs of immigrants, the government will pay for 300 minutes of instruction a week in "native language and culture;" 150 minutes of this must be outside of regular school hours. France and Germany have bilateral agreements with a number of the nations from which "guest workers" come, to provide qualified teachers who provide optional language and cultural maintenance programs.

10. **Regular Assessment of Progress--and Corrective Action**

With this point we return to the first, in recognition that what is required above all is the willingness to treat each linguistic minority student as possessing unique strengths and unique needs, as representing a potential that cannot be defined or limited by ethnic heritage or by proficiency in English.

No student should be allowed to drift along within a program that provides support at the expense of appropriate educational challenges. Continual

assessment and appropriate modifications of the educational program of each student are essential. While there is far more to learn than the "basic skills" of reading, writing and mathematics, including two cultural heritages, it is fair to say that if they do not master both basic and higher-order skills during the years when we are responsible for their education, their later chances in life will be greatly diminished.

This requires, as one urban educator pointed out, that regular classroom teachers must develop the skills to recognize when a student's "floundering" is based upon lagging linguistic development rather than upon other learning difficulties.

The 1985 school reform legislation, Chapter 188, provides for annual assessment of the progress of all students under a new testing program. This could serve as a valuable opportunity to obtain uniform information on how well linguistic minority students are progressing toward a mastery of those skills essential for success in school and later life. Such an assessment should include both progress in English-language proficiency (as required by Chapter 71A, Section 2) and also progress in mastering the subject matter included in the curriculum. For students less than three years in a bilingual program, school systems should assess progress in subject matter mastery in the primary language of the students.

The issue here is one of our accountability. So long as we can plead ignorance of how well linguistic minority students are doing academically, we will not be accountable to them or to their parents, and we will not meet our moral and legal responsibility to provide an equal educational opportunity.

CONCLUSIONS

In brief, there are no grounds for complacency about our efforts, in Massachusetts, to meet the educational needs of linguistic minority students.

Our schools appear not to have provided the necessary mix of support and challenge, at least for Hispanic students, the only group for whom we have detailed statewide educational

results. Some of the same problems may be experienced by Cape Verdean and Haitian immigrants, whose numbers--like those of Hispanics--are growing rapidly.

Scattered evidence suggests that European immigrants do better academically, perhaps because they join well-assimilated ethnic communities deriving from the late nineteenth-century immigration.

It is too early to assess the experience of the new Southeast Asian refugees; indeed, we are still struggling to find classrooms and teachers for them. Some early indications suggest that many are "getting on their feet" academically, but a concerted effort will be needed over the next few years. We must above all take care not to repeat any mistakes that we may have made with groups that arrived earlier.

There are two general policy conclusions that may be drawn from this review. The first is that we must become much more clear about our expectations, much more willing to assess on an on-going basis how linguistic minority students are doing. It is unacceptable to deduce their educational difficulties from a high drop-out rate! Local and state accountability for results should become far more explicit.

The second is that the process of language acquisition is not a simple matter of learning to "get by," but requires on-going developmental support well beyond the period when a separate bilingual program is an appropriate placement. This means that the entire K-12 curriculum must provide opportunities to increase mastery of English, even for students for whom it is their "first language." English-dominance is not the same thing as a solid mastery of the language. The responsibility for promoting such mastery cannot be left to bilingual program staff alone.

Only by involving the whole educational team of a school--and ultimately of a school system--in developing an educational experience for each student that is both supportive and challenging can we provide real educational equity. Defining and treating students on the basis of language proficiency alone is bad education; doing so on the basis of ethnic identity alone is an even graver dereliction. Fundamental rights are at stake, and the old doctrine of "separate but equal" has no more place when applied to Hispanic or Asian students than when applied to Black students.

The solutions to the civil rights challenge represented by the growing presence in our schools of linguistic minority students will in the end be educational ones: more effective assessment of needs and strengths, more effective teaching of English, and approaches to language and cultural maintenance that do not get in the way of full integration into American schooling and society.

This challenge must be heard by those responsible for every aspect of our educational systems. Bilingual specialists will have a critical part to play in finding effective responses, and they need to learn to give leadership and to collaborate in problem-solving across the whole spectrum of education. It is encouraging that a former bilingual program director is now superintendent of one of our larger cities--John Correiro of Fall River--and that he is bringing staff out of that city's bilingual program into other roles within the system.

Ultimately we will develop the capacity to meet the leading educational equity challenge of our time through making linguistic minority students everyone's responsibility.

DEVELOPMENTS ON REFUGEE EDUCATION IN 1985-86

by Maureen M. Wark

- Southeast Asian refugees continued to be the fastest growing linguistic minority student population in the state. The Cambodian students showed the largest increase with Laotians second and Vietnamese student increases third among Southeast Asian refugee (see Chart page 153).

- There has also been a sizable increase of Haitian "Entrants," especially in Cambridge and Boston. Refugees from South and Central American countries have also increased. These Spanish speaking linguistic minority students have been more easily assimilated into existing Spanish Bilingual programs in local school districts than have the Southeast Asian and Haitian students.

- The rapid and sizable increase in the number of limited English-speaking refugee students during the school year and after local school department budgets are finalized has placed a severe financial burden on local school districts. This financial constraint has in some systems made it impossible to comply with minimal state standards of program compliance.

- Most of the state funds and all of the federal funds targeted toward meeting the educational needs of the refugee students are on a supplementary basis and do not assist a local school district with the cost of hiring Bilingual or English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom teachers.

- State reimbursements to municipalities for bilingual students, under Chapter 70, go to the general funds of

the city or town and they seldom are returned to the school system to meet the cost of educating the new LEP students entering a system during a school year.

LOWELL

Progress in meeting the educational needs of the Cambodian, Laotian and Vietnamese refugee students in Lowell:

1. Chapter 636 funded ($25,000) guidance and counseling services at Lowell High School provided by Metropolitan Indochinese Counseling.

2. Chapter 636 funded rental of school facilities and integrated extended day services for Cambodian students at Moore Street School; temporary for 1985-86 only.

3. EEO provided technical assistance to the school system to find additional native language teachers and aides for the Bilingual Program.

Lowell is one of the school districts showing the largest increase of Cambodian students again during this school year. They had run out of classrooms and money for needed teachers as of February 1986. Over the next several months Lowell must develop an assignment plan effective September 1986 which will fully desegregate Cambodian students and permit their part-time integration in activities with regular-program students.

REVERE

1. Technical assistance from EEO has been ongoing during the year to improve access and equity for Cambodian students within the Revere public school system.

2. The major result of this assistance has been the development of a Voluntary Racial Balance Plan by the school department, approved by the Revere School Committee in March 1986. This plan is the first in the state totally based on resolution of minority isolation and equitable education for Cambodian students.

3. Revere, like Lowell, has exhausted the available facilities to house their increased refugee

student population and funds to hire additional Bilingual and ESL classroom teachers.

BOSTON

A whole new refugee student population has surfaced this year in the Boston Public Schools. These are the 29 Kmhmu students whose country of origin is Laos but whose language is entirely different than Laotian. The Kmhmu describe themselves as a pre-literate cultural group. While some of the adults and children speak Laotian it is not their "language of dominance." The two languages have completely different "alphabets" so reading and writing skills are not transferrable. We are working with the Boston Bilingual administrators and staff to best meet the educational needs of these students at this time.

GENERAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Translation of basic guidance materials for Southeast Asian students who are interested in a college education. College Board Examinations, TESOL timetables and registration information plus financial aid and state scholarships available, have been translated into Vietnamese, Khmer, (Cambodian Language) and Laotian. These materials will be updated each fall and distributed to the guidance departments of appropriate high schools in the state. Southeast Asian students and their parents can then be informed in their own language of important information needed to facilitate their goals of higher education.

A major accomplishment of EEO, with much appreciated assistance from the Legal Department, has been the development of an "Interdepartmental Letter of Agreement," between the Massachusetts Department of Education and the Massachusetts Office of Refugee Resettlement (MORR), based on the Governor's Executive Order #257. This document clearly states our commitment as a state agency to protecting the civil rights of all refugee school age children, guaranteeing them access to all educational programs and equity within the school systems of the state. It also commits department staff to work with local school districts to improve and monitor the quality of programs specifically designed for limited English-speaking refugee students.

MORR has agreed to maintain and improve communication with the department concerning the numbers of refugee students

planned for resettlement in a city or town and any other relevant data so we can assist that school system to plan for and meet the new students needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Our recommendations remain the same as last year's:

Continued and improved communication from the resettlment agencies and the Massachusetts Office for Refugee Resettlement through the Massachusetts Department of Education to the Local School Districts.

Increased technical assistance to local school districts to help them provide effective bilingual programs and improved bilingual curriculum and to hire and obtain certification for Native Language staff members.

A major funding increase by the state to local school districts during the school year if a large number of refugee students enroll in the school system after local budgets have been finalized, since federal funds are inadequate to meet these student needs.

Funds to assist local school districts to provide the Special Education services, e.g., assessments, tests, and evaluations in native language.

RANKED BY INCREASE IN ASIAN ENROLLMENT

	1984	1985	Number	%
New Bedford	42	45	3	7%
Salem	41	45	4	10%
Medford	56	62	6	11%
Springfield	172	181	9	5%
Methuen	34	48	14	41%
Holyoke	40	62	22	55%
Fall River	75	100	25	33%
Brockton	274	301	27	10%
Quincy	375	403	28	7%
Lawrence	212	251	39	18%
Worcester	426	468	42	10%
Cambridge	389	440	51	13%
Somerville	142	204	62	44%
Chelsea	267	332	65	24%
Lynn	186	284	98	53%
Revere	255	364	109	43%
Lowell	703	1,086	383	54%
Boston	4,310	4,719	409	9%
Totals	7,999	9,395	1,396	17%
State	15,900	18,014	2,114	13%

Note: From Table 3 Data of October 1, 1985 Mass. Department of Education

MASSACHUSETTS & FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

1. Requirements under State Law

State law defines a school whose enrollment is more than 50% "non-white" as "racially imbalanced," and requires the school system operating such a school to implement various measures that will encourage and allow voluntary transfers of students that will have the effect of eliminating this condition.

Various incentives are provided to encourage and assist school districts in doing so, including transportation reimbursements, increased construction reimbursements, funding for magnet schools, and an "Equal Education Improvement Fund" to improve the quality of education in desegregated schools. These incentives, and the urban/suburban Metco Program, are offered under Chapter 636 of 1974.

A difficulty arises in the definition of "non-white." When the original Racial Imbalance Act was prepared, in 1965, there were few Hispanic students in the Commonwealth, and the drafters did not define how "non-white" should be applied. Early controversies arose over whether Cape Verdean and Chinese students should be counted as "non-white" along with Black students (decisions were reached that they should be), and there has been a continuing uncertainty about how to count Hispanic students. As is well known, there is a wide range of racial characteristics among Hispanic peoples, even though all are considered "minority" under Federal law.

On the advice of then-Attorney General Brooke, the responsibility has been placed upon local school officials to use their best judgment as to whether

particular students should be considered "white" or "non-white" in making the racial census. I have also provided detailed guidelines on how and why to carry out the racial census.

2. **Requirements under Federal Law**

The term "non-white" is not used by the Office for Civil Rights or by the desegregation cases which have been resolved in the federal court system.

A comprehensive category of "minority" is used, which includes Black, Hispanic, Native American (that is, Indian), and Asian-American Students.

Federal law does not create an obligation to reduce racial imbalance, as does state law. Instead, it forbids official action that results in the segregation or isolation of minority students. The story of desegregation cases since Brown in 1954 is largely one of defining the kinds of actions which would constitute such segregation, and the kinds of remedial measures which are necessary once a finding of illegal segregation has been made.

3. **Reconciling the Two in Massachusetts**

- A school system with schools more than 50% "non-white" must implement measures to encourage voluntary transfers that will improve racial balance.

- If the system is planning schools, or redistricting, or changing grade structures, or permitting school transfers, it must take racial balance into account in so doing.

- A school system with a disproportionate number of "minority" students in certain schools may take a variety of measures--including voluntary transfers, redistricting, or changing grade structures--to reduce this isolation.

- If the system is planning schools, or re-districting, or changing grade structures, or permitting student transfers, it must assure that these measures do not result in further segregation, whether intended or unintended but predictable.

- The Board of Education must take care not to approve measures (school construction, for example) which would result in further segregation.

- The Board may provide financial support and encouragement to school systems to reduce racial isolation on a voluntary basis, even when racial imbalance as such does not exist but is potential.

In practice, what this means is that we give particular attention to assuring that school systems do not take actions that would constitute official action resulting in segregation of minority students, and that they correct the effects of any past actions that they may have taken that had that result. We provide advice and assistance to protect the school system--and the Board--from desegregation litigation.

Over the past ten years every school system which we have approached with such concerns has taken appropriate steps without the need for state enforcement actions, though sometimes only after extended discussions and negotiations!

Massachusetts Among The States

In general, state government and state education agencies have been perceived--correctly--as reluctant and ineffective defenders of the constitutional rights of minority students, including the right not to be segregated. During the first round of school desegregation cases, the laws and policies of the seventeen states with laws requiring racially-separate schools were a primary basis for ordering remedial plans.

More recently, desegregation litigation in the North has generally involved the states as defendants, and Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana have been found guilty of contributing to unconstitutional racial segregation through policies and practices or through neglect of legal responsibilities. In response, and also as a result of the desire of the federal government to "get off the hook" of enforcing desegregation requirements, there has been considerable interest in the state role in desegregation and equal educational opportunity. For example, I testified earlier this month in the Cleveland case, which is approaching the stage of orders expanding the state monitoring role.

While thirty-nine states have passed some type of legislation or policy in support of equal opportunity and/or desegregation, only five states--Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania--have ever initiated enforcement actions to require that school systems eliminate racial isolation.

Enforcement in Massachusetts was carried out from 1965 to 1974 on the basis of the Racial Imbalance Law, drafted by the Department of Education with the assistance of a Board-appointed study group. Under this statute racial balance plans were approved for Boston, Cambridge, Medford, and Springfield during the late 1960's; when implementation (mostly involving school construction) proved dilatory, the Board ordered development and implementation of "short-term" plans for Boston, New Bedford, and Springfield. In five rulings of the Supreme Judicial Court the Board's enforcement actions received strong support.

The racial Imbalance Law was drastically amended in 1974, substituting greatly increased funding for the power to order school redistricting. Since Boston and Springfield were already under court orders to implement the plans previously ordered by the Board, this seemed no great loss, and the next several years were taken up with setting up programs of state financial support to desegregation which are unparalleled among the states.

Only three states--Massachusetts, New York, and Wisconsin--have appropriated state funds directly to support implementation of desegregation without being ordered to do so by a federal court.

The Massachusetts program of support for desegregation has several inter-locking elements, presented here in the order of their creation:

(1) **Construction assistance** has involved extra financial support for those construction/renovation projects that are undertaken as part of a racial balance plan; as noted, early plans generally called for building new schools with enlarged attendance areas which would draw racially-diverse enrollments. Schools have been built under this provision in Boston, Cambridge, Lawrence, New Bedford, Springfield, and Worcester with a total cost of more than $600 million.

(2) **Transportation reimbursement** at 100% was originally established to support "Operation Exodus," a program organized by Black parents in Boston to transport their

children to available space in predominantly-white schools; it has since proved of tremendous benefit to Boston and Springfield, in particular, as they have implemented their court-ordered plans. The Board has supported legislation (H. 72) to extend this support to other desegregating districts.

(3) **Urban/suburban transfers** (commonly called "Metco" after the organization which pioneered the program) are supported by an annual appropriation; this pays for tuition, specialized support staff, and transportation costs for more than 3,300 minority students who attend suburban Boston and Springfield schools.

(4) **The Equal Education Improvement Funds** (FY 1986: $8,441,900) are set up for each system implementing a racial balance or desegregation plan, and each fund receives a share of the funds appropriated proportionate to the number of students reassigned. These funds may be used in any way to strengthen education, subject to the guidelines and priorities established by the Board.

(5) **Magnet school** funding (FY 1986: $5,050,000) supports additional costs of magnet schools, and also the costs of part-time magnet programs. These funds have been the "cutting edge" of state desegregation efforts, since they have permitted such systems as Holyoke and Worcester to develop voluntary desegregation plans and to implement them with increased support for education. More than seventy magnet school currently share these funds, and represent models of integrated urban education.

Over the past eight years state efforts in Massachusetts have taken a new direction, as we have worked with school systems to develop and implement voluntary plans, using the standards of the United States Constitution rather than the Massachusetts Racial Imbalance Law. Our goal has been to assure that the rights of every minority child not to be segregated and to receive equal educational opportunities were protected. Voluntary actions has prevented the desegregation litigation which was necessary in Boston because of the narrow scope of state racial balance efforts. We are particularly proud that it has not been necessary to initiate a single enforcement action since 1973.

ENROLLMENT TRENDS & PATTERNS

by Charles Glenn

The Racial Imbalance Act of 1985 ("Chapter 641") employed the categories "White" and "Non-White," and these continue to have standing under the replacement statute of 1984 ("Chapter 636"). These categories were chosen at a time when the only significant minority group in mind was Black, and have always caused difficulties with respect to Hispanic students, who do not constitute a single racial category. Until 1974 Hispanic students were found (or, rather, concealed) in both the White and the Non-White enrollment figures in the October 1 individual school reports.

In order to conform to the standards used by federal courts in cases brought under the Fourteenth Amendment, however, the Department of Education has made a practice, since 1974, of requiring that racial statistics be reported in the categories "Black," "White," "Hispanic," "Asian," and "American Indian" or "Native American." As an unsatisfactory compromise between a recognition of the racial diversity of the Hispanic population and a desire to know how many Hispanic students are enrolled, we have used the categories "Hispanic White" and "Hispanic Non-White."

The Board has supported amendment of various provisions of Chapter 636 to extend the benefits available under the law to school systems with few "Non-White" students which are desegregating Hispanic students in order to meet their obligations under the United States Constitution. The last such amendment which will be necessary, it appears, is the present H. 72 now before Legislature.

Under some circumstances desegregation plans may also take into account the isolation of Portuguese-American and Franco-American students, but these groups are not included in the "minority" categories in the racial census or in the discussion which follows.

Statewide Enrollment Changes: 1974 to 1985

	1974	1985	Change	
White	1,101,033	725,578	-375,455	-34%
Black	59,202	57,360	-1,842	-3%
Hispanic	27,750	44,493	16,743	60%
Asian/Native Am	6,703	18,999	12,296	183%
Total	1,194,688	846,430	-348,258	-29%

White	92%	86%
Black	5%	7%
Hispanic	2%	5%
Asian/Native American	0.5%	2%

The public school enrollment in Massachusetts remains overwhelmingly "White" (a category which conceals a wide ethnic diversity, of course, including recent immigrants), but it is Hispanic and Asian enrollment which is growing. Black enrollment has grown slightly from 56,563 in 1984, but it is well short of the peak of 61,422 in 1978. "Native American" or Indian enrollment continues stable at under a thousand.

The proportion of minority students in our Massachusetts enrollment is roughly comparable to that of "migrant" children in the nations of Western Europe. As in France or Germany, the distribution among our types of schools is by no means even, with minority students more heavily concentrated in the lower grades and in the secondary schools from which a low proportion of students go on to college. Another section of this report focuses on the generally dismal academic outcomes for Hispanic students, comparable to those of Portuguese and Algerian students in France or Turkish students in Germany and Moroccan students in the Netherlands.

In one respect, at least, we are in advance of the European example: in active efforts to increase access. Our Metco programs enrolls 3,437 minority students from Boston and Springfield in many of our most college-oriented suburban high schools, while those two cities (which continue to enroll 61% of the Black students in the Commonwealth), have aggressive, State-funded programs to increase minority enrollment in their most academically demanding high schools.

Four out of five of the minority students in Massachusetts attend schools impacted by State desegregation funds under Chapter 636.

For the 3,437 Metco students, the full cost of education, transportation, and extra support is funded under Section 7.

For nearly 80,000 minority students in the desegregating school systems, a variety of educational programs are funded under Sections 1 and 8 for more than $12 million. These systems have also built more than $600 million in new school facilities under a reimbursement provision of Section 1, while receiving extra transportation assistance amounting to millions each year under the same section.

Another 7,244 minority students are enrolled in school systems which are currently developing desegregation plans with funding under Section 8.

And what of the one minority student in five who does not attend any of the schools impacted by Chapter 636? Our greatest concern is with Chelsea, which is 54.2% minority with nearly 1,400 Hispanic students, and it is at the top of our agenda for FY 1987. Other communities--Fitchburg, Haverhill, Northampton, Somerville, Taunton--enroll smaller proportions of minority students but are clearly eligible for assistance on the same basis as Methuen or Salem. Several thousand minority students are scattered among communities where there is no justification for funding desegregation efforts, but the regional education centers seek to assure that curriculum and school opractices comply with the requirements of Chapter 622, the Equal Educational Opportunity law.

The chart which follows shows the number of students in each racial/ethnic category enrolled in the fifteen cities with which the Bureau is currently working.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1985	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	White	Total	% White
DESEGREGATING							
Boston	28599	10438	4719	274	16674	60704	27.5%
Cambridge	2268	859	440	9	4221	7797	54.1%
Holyoke	293	3038	62	3	3481	6877	50.6%
Lawrence	281	4776	251	5	4045	9358	43.2%
Lowell	313	1710	1086	9	9223	12341	74.7%
Medford	253	27	62	0	5048	5392	93.6%
New Bedford	1742	1083	45	9	11398	14277	79.8%
Springfield	6513	5874	181	8	10110	22686	44.6%
Worcester	1357	2789	468	47	15102	19763	76.4%
Total	41619	30594	7314	364	79302	159195	49.8%
% of State	72.6%	68.8%	40.6%	37.0%	10.9%	18.8%	
PLANNING TO DESEGREGATE							
Brockton	1914	1051	301	46	12290	15602	78.8%
Fall River *	141	140	100	0	11569	11950	96.8%
Lynn	992	856	284	7	8969	11108	80.7%
Methuen	38	289	48	1	4816	5192	92.8%
Revere **	30	50	364	0	4278	4722	90.6%
Salem	95	447	45	5	3467	4059	85.4%
Total	3210	2833	1142	59	45389	52633	86.2%
% of State	5.6%	6.4%	6.3%	6.0%	6.3%	6.2%	
Combined	44829	33427	8456	423	124691	211828	58.9%
% of State	78.2%	75.1%	46.9%	42.9%	17.2%	25.0%	
State	57360	44493	18014	985	725578	846430	85.7%

* Fall River is planning to desegregate Portuguese-speaking students, who are reported as "White"

** Revere is planning to desegregate Cambodian students

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENROLLMENT DATA BY RACE

This section contains school enrollment tables for Boston, Brockton, Cambridge, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, Medford, Methuen, New Bedford, Revere, Salem, Springfield and Worcester. The table for each school system shows enrollments by race for every school in the system. The data are taken from the Individual School Report, October 1, 1985.

There are two sets of numbers for each school. An example is the Longfellow School in Cambridge:

	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
# Students	43	129	25	0	280	477
% of Total	12	27	5.2	0	58.7	

The first line "# Students" shows the actual number of students enrolled from each racial group at the Longfellow: 43 Black students, 129 Hispanic, 25 Asian, 0 American Indian and 280 White students, for a total of 477 students. The second line "% of Total" gives the percentage that each racial group composes of the total enrollment of the school. Thus, Black students from 9% of the student body, Hispanic students 27%, Asian students 5.2% and White students 58.7% of the student body.

District totals are given at the end of the table. Again, the first line shows the actual number of students from each racial group enrolled in the district and the second line shows the proportional (percentage) enrollment of each group in the district.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

BOSTON

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
AGASSIZ						
# STUDENTS	218	417	6	3	127	771
% OF TOTAL	28.3	54.1	.8	.4	16.5	
ALEXANDER HAMILTON						
# STUDENTS	66	16	261	2	49	394
% OF TOTAL	16.8	4.1	66.2	.5	12.4	
JACKSON MANN						
# STUDENTS	293	27	311		132	763
% OF TOTAL	38.4	3.5	40.8		17.3	
BEETHOVEN						
# STUDENTS	97	11	5	3	120	236
% OF TOTAL	41.1	4.7	2.1	1.3	50.8	
CARTER DEVELOP DAY CAR						
# STUDENTS	6	11			6	23
% OF TOTAL	26.1	47.8			26.1	
CHARLES E MACKEY						
# STUDENTS	207	98	3		77	385
% OF TOTAL	53.8	25.5	.8		20.0	
CHARLES SUMNER						
# STUDENTS	249	37	6		219	511
% OF TOTAL	48.7	7.2	1.2		42.9	
CHARLES H TAYLOR						
# STUDENTS	421	15	8	2	65	511
% OF TOTAL	82.4	2.9	1.6	.4	12.7	
CURTIS GUILD						
# STUDENTS	127	22	6	3	42	200
% OF TOTAL	63.5	11.0	3.0	1.5	21.0	
DANTE ALIGHIERI						
# STUDENTS	14	20	27	2	134	197
% OF TOTAL	7.1	10.2	13.7	1.0	68.0	
DAVID A ELLIS						
# STUDENTS	273	188	3		50	514
% OF TOTAL	53.1	36.6	.6		9.7	
DEARBORN						
# STUDENTS	243	56	2	4	109	414
% OF TOTAL	58.7	13.5	.5	1.0	26.3	
DENNIS C HALEY						
# STUDENTS	165	46	10	8	71	300
% OF TOTAL	55.0	15.3	3.3	2.7	23.7	
DONALD MCKAY						
# STUDENTS	216	54	17		93	380
% OF TOTAL	56.8	14.2	4.5		24.5	
EDWARD EVERETT						
# STUDENTS	153	29	2	2	96	282
% OF TOTAL	54.3	10.3	.7	.7	34.0	
ELIHU GREENWOOD						
# STUDENTS	309	21	2		162	494
% OF TOTAL	62.6	4.3	.4		32.8	
ELIOT ELEMENTARY						
# STUDENTS	114	60	15	1	58	248
% OF TOTAL	46.0	24.2	6.0	.4	23.4	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

BOSTON

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
ELLIS MENDELL						
# STUDENTS	109	108	2	1	47	267
% OF TOTAL	40.8	40.4	.7	.4	17.6	
EMILY A FIFIELD						
# STUDENTS	276	12	3	3	41	335
% OF TOTAL	82.4	3.6	.9	.9	12.2	
FARRAGUT						
# STUDENTS	108	67	49		43	267
% OF TOTAL	40.4	25.1	18.4		16.1	
FRANCIS PARKMAN						
# STUDENTS	112	45	11	1	31	200
% OF TOTAL	56.0	22.5	5.5	.5	15.5	
FRANK V THOMPSON MIDDL						
# STUDENTS	330	9	6		56	401
% OF TOTAL	82.3	2.2	1.5		14.0	
FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT						
# STUDENTS	133	5	1		154	293
% OF TOTAL	45.4	1.7	.3		52.6	
GEORGE H CONLEY						
# STUDENTS	103	6			102	211
% OF TOTAL	48.8	2.8			48.3	
HARRIET A BALDWIN						
# STUDENTS	67	57	158	2	49	333
% OF TOTAL	20.1	17.1	47.4	.6	14.7	
HENRY GREN						
# STUDENTS	156	9	1		113	279
% OF TOTAL	55.9	3.2	.4		40.5	
HENRY L HIGGINSON						
# STUDENTS	114	34	11		38	197
% OF TOTAL	57.9	17.3	5.6		19.3	
PHYLLIS WHEATLEY MIDDL						
# STUDENTS	176	50	30	3	68	327
% OF TOTAL	53.8	15.3	9.2	.9	20.8	
HUGH ROE O'DONNELL						
# STUDENTS	5	16	41	4	221	287
% OF TOTAL	1.7	5.6	14.3	1.4	77.0	
JAMES CONDON ELEM						
# STUDENTS	273	136	8	2	377	796
% OF TOTAL	34.3	17.1	1.0	.3	47.4	
JAMES A GARFIELD ELEM						
# STUDENTS	81	46	19		90	236
% OF TOTAL	34.3	19.5	8.1		38.1	
JAMES M HENNIGAN						
# STUDENTS	257	220	30	3	112	622
% OF TOTAL	41.3	35.4	4.8	.5	18.0	
JAMES J CHITTICK						
# STUDENTS	366	8	2	2	43	421
% OF TOTAL	86.9	1.9	.5	.5	10.2	
JAMES OTIS						
# STUDENTS	31	80	5		266	382
% OF TOTAL	8.1	20.9	1.3		69.6	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

BOSTON

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
JOHN F KENNEDY						
# STUDENTS	139	264	1	1	47	452
% OF TOTAL	30.8	58.4	.2	.2	10.4	
JOHN P HOLLAND						
# STUDENTS	588	207	3	5	79	882
% OF TOTAL	66.7	23.5	.3	.6	9.0	
JOHN D PHILBRICK						
# STUDENTS	85	12		1	81	179
% OF TOTAL	47.5	6.7		.6	45.3	
JOHN MARSHALL						
# STUDENTS	547	270	22	6	104	949
% OF TOTAL	57.6	28.5	2.3	.6	11.0	
JOHN W MCCORMACK						
# STUDENTS	164	174	17	9	212	576
% OF TOTAL	28.5	30.2	3.0	1.6	36.8	
JOHN WINTHROP						
# STUDENTS	129	84		2	66	281
% OF TOTAL	45.9	29.9		.7	23.5	
JOSEPH P TYNAN						
# STUDENTS	203	8	1	2	146	360
% OF TOTAL	56.4	2.2	.3	.6	40.6	
JOSEPH J HURLEY						
# STUDENTS	163	158	6	1	37	365
% OF TOTAL	44.7	43.3	1.6	.3	10.1	
JOSEPH LEE						
# STUDENTS	382	69	4	2	106	563
% OF TOTAL	67.9	12.3	.7	.4	18.8	
JOSEPH P MANNING						
# STUDENTS	84	24	3		76	187
% OF TOTAL	44.9	12.8	1.6		40.6	
JOYCE KILMER						
# STUDENTS	115	5	5	1	220	346
% OF TOTAL	33.2	1.4	1.4	.3	63.6	
HARVARD-KENT						
# STUDENTS	165	20	154	1	121	461
% OF TOTAL	35.8	4.3	33.4	.2	26.2	
LONGFELLOW						
# STUDENTS	114	44	3		133	294
% OF TOTAL	38.8	15.0	1.0		45.2	
LUCY STONE						
# STUDENTS	170	13	2	2	28	215
% OF TOTAL	79.1	6.0	.9	.9	13.0	
MANASSAH E BRADLEY						
# STUDENTS	13	12	19	3	305	352
% OF TOTAL	3.7	3.4	5.4	.9	86.6	
MARGARET FULLER						
# STUDENTS	121	97			42	260
% OF TOTAL	46.5	37.3			16.2	
MATTAHUNT						
# STUDENTS	470	137	7	1	266	881
% OF TOTAL	53.3	15.6	.8	.1	30.2	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

BOSTON

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
MATHER						
# STUDENTS	387	66	6	4	120	583
% OF TOTAL	66.4	11.3	1.0	.7	20.6	
MAURICE J TOBIN						
# STUDENTS	182	274	62	6	71	595
% OF TOTAL	30.6	46.1	10.4	1.0	11.9	
MICHAEL J PERKINS						
# STUDENTS	75	31	7	4	172	289
% OF TOTAL	26.0	10.7	2.4	1.4	59.5	
MOZART						
# STUDENTS	102	15	3		49	169
% OF TOTAL	60.4	8.9	1.8		29.0	
RICHARD J MURPHY						
# STUDENTS	574	32	8		193	807
% OF TOTAL	71.1	4.0	1.0		23.9	
NATHAN HALE						
# STUDENTS	110	36	4		32	182
% OF TOTAL	60.4	19.8	2.2		17.6	
OLIVER HAZARD PERRY						
# STUDENTS	42	11	1		94	148
% OF TOTAL	28.4	7.4	.7		63.5	
WILLIAM H OHRENBERGER						
# STUDENTS	249	37	78	8	109	481
% OF TOTAL	51.8	7.7	16.2	1.7	22.7	
PATRICK J KENNEDY						
# STUDENTS	5	14	12		240	271
% OF TOTAL	1.8	5.2	4.4		88.6	
O'HEARN PATRICK						
# STUDENTS	110	11	6	1	130	258
% OF TOTAL	42.6	4.3	2.3	.4	50.4	
PAUL A DEVER						
# STUDENTS	173	175	4	5	183	540
% OF TOTAL	32.0	32.4	.7	.9	33.9	
PAULINE AGASSIZ SHAW						
# STUDENTS	253	3	2	1	39	298
% OF TOTAL	84.9	1.0	.7	.3	13.1	
PHINEAS BATES						
# STUDENTS	96	33	4	4	125	262
% OF TOTAL	36.6	12.6	1.5	1.5	47.7	
QUINCY E DICKERMAN						
# STUDENTS	308	55		3	26	392
% OF TOTAL	78.6	14.0		.8	6.6	
JOSIAH QUINCY						
# STUDENTS	249	28	430		124	831
% OF TOTAL	30.0	3.4	51.7		14.9	
RALPH WALDO EMERSON						
# STUDENTS	194	75		3	27	299
% OF TOTAL	64.9	25.1		1.0	9.0	
ROGER CLAP						
# STUDENTS	56	19	5	1	120	201
% OF TOTAL	27.9	9.5	2.5	.5	59.7	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

BOSTON

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
SAMUEL ADAMS						
# STUDENTS	23	24	10		200	257
% OF TOTAL	8.9	9.3	3.9		77.8	
SAMUEL W MASON						
# STUDENTS	54	27			38	119
% OF TOTAL	45.4	22.7			31.9	
SARAH GREENWOOD						
# STUDENTS	277	160	1		59	497
% OF TOTAL	55.7	32.2	.2		11.9	
THEODORE ROOSEVELT MID						
# STUDENTS	134	86	5		33	258
% OF TOTAL	51.9	33.3	1.9		12.8	
THOMAS GARDNER						
# STUDENTS	85	153	64		103	405
% OF TOTAL	21.0	37.8	15.8		25.4	
THOMAS J KENNY						
# STUDENTS	111	3	4	4	156	278
% OF TOTAL	39.9	1.1	1.4	1.4	56.1	
WARREN-PRESCOTT						
# STUDENTS	116	15	169		172	472
% OF TOTAL	24.6	3.2	35.8		36.4	
WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNIN						
# STUDENTS	166	19	6	3	165	359
% OF TOTAL	46.2	5.3	1.7	.8	46.0	
WM E ENDICOTT						
# STUDENTS	198	8	2		25	233
% OF TOTAL	85.0	3.4	.9		10.7	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY						
# STUDENTS	189	32	3		115	339
% OF TOTAL	55.8	9.4	.9		33.9	
WILLIAM E RUSSELL						
# STUDENTS	127	143	6	1	108	385
% OF TOTAL	33.0	37.1	1.6	.3	28.1	
WILLIAM MONROE TROTTER						
# STUDENTS	338	118	20	15	145	636
% OF TOTAL	53.1	18.6	3.1	2.4	22.8	
WINSHIP ELEMENTARY						
# STUDENTS	64	194	34	1	88	381
% OF TOTAL	16.8	50.9	8.9	.3	23.1	
JAMES M CURLEY						
# STUDENTS	154	61	6		67	288
% OF TOTAL	53.5	21.2	2.1		23.3	
BLACKSTONE						
# STUDENTS	345	453	35	3	99	935
% OF TOTAL	36.9	48.4	3.7	.3	10.6	
JOSEPH H BARNES MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	18	75	36	5	506	640
% OF TOTAL	2.8	11.7	5.6	.8	79.1	
MARTIN LUTHER KING JR						
# STUDENTS	243	119	16		89	467
% OF TOTAL	52.0	25.5	3.4		19.1	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

BOSTON

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
GROVER CLEVELAND						
# STUDENTS	613	216	9	10	92	940
% OF TOTAL	65.2	23.0	1.0	1.1	9.8	
MARY E CURLEY MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	269	355	6	7	89	726
% OF TOTAL	37.1	48.9	.8	1.0	12.3	
THOMAS A EDISON JR MID						
# STUDENTS	141	134	133		87	495
% OF TOTAL	28.5	27.1	26.9		17.6	
CLARENCE R EDWARDS MID						
# STUDENTS	148	108	248	1	80	585
% OF TOTAL	25.3	18.5	42.4	.2	13.7	
PATRICK F GAVIN MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	205	53	5	4	194	461
% OF TOTAL	44.5	11.5	1.1	.9	42.1	
OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES						
# STUDENTS	240	19	3	6	49	317
% OF TOTAL	75.7	6.0	.9	1.9	15.5	
WASHINGTON IRVING MIDD						
# STUDENTS	285	34	110		188	617
% OF TOTAL	46.2	5.5	17.8		30.5	
SOLOMON LEVENBERG MIDD						
# STUDENTS	299	7	3	1	69	379
% OF TOTAL	78.9	1.8	.8	.3	18.2	
LEWIS MIDDLE SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	134	42	2	2	34	214
% OF TOTAL	62.6	19.6	.9	.9	15.9	
WM B ROGERS MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	415	27	4	3	124	573
% OF TOTAL	72.4	4.7	.7	.5	21.6	
ROBERT GOULD SHAW MIDD						
# STUDENTS	155	19	1		56	231
% OF TOTAL	67.1	8.2	.4		24.2	
WILLIAM H TAFT MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	165	160	92	3	120	540
% OF TOTAL	30.6	29.6	17.0	.6	22.2	
JAMES P TIMILTY MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	253	159	33	1	57	503
% OF TOTAL	50.3	31.6	6.6	.2	11.3	
WOODROW WILSON MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	507	40	5	3	105	660
% OF TOTAL	76.8	6.1	.8	.5	15.9	
BRIGHTON HIGH						
# STUDENTS	325	199	224	1	178	927
% OF TOTAL	35.1	21.5	24.2	.1	19.2	
CHARLESTOWN HIGH						
# STUDENTS	441	221	251	2	219	1134
% OF TOTAL	38.9	19.5	22.1	.2	19.3	
DORCHESTER HIGH						
# STUDENTS	598	162	6	1	132	899
% OF TOTAL	66.5	18.0	.7	.1	14.7	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

BOSTON

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
JEREMIAH E BURKE HIGH						
# STUDENTS	509	78	10	2	95	694
% OF TOTAL	73.3	11.2	1.4	.3	13.7	
EAST BOSTON HIGH						
# STUDENTS	207	68	33	6	763	1077
% OF TOTAL	19.2	6.3	3.1	.6	70.8	
THE ENGLISH HIGH						
# STUDENTS	968	367	80	8	300	1723
% OF TOTAL	56.2	21.3	4.6	.5	17.4	
MADISON PARK HIGH						
# STUDENTS	1015	354	16	6	221	1612
% OF TOTAL	63.0	22.0	1.0	.4	13.7	
BOSTON LATIN ACADEMY						
# STUDENTS	554	73	166	8	722	1523
% OF TOTAL	36.4	4.8	10.9	.5	47.4	
HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	695	23	6	4	175	903
% OF TOTAL	77.0	2.5	.7	.4	19.4	
JAMAICA PLAIN HIGH						
# STUDENTS	443	284	9	1	134	871
% OF TOTAL	50.9	32.6	1.0	.1	15.4	
BOSTON LATIN						
# STUDENTS	586	160	339	5	1214	2304
% OF TOTAL	25.4	6.9	14.7	.2	52.7	
SOUTH BOSTON HIGH						
# STUDENTS	395	202	149	10	332	1088
% OF TOTAL	36.3	18.6	13.7	.9	30.5	
WEST ROXBURY SCH						
# STUDENTS	793	68	12	3	478	1354
% OF TOTAL	58.6	5.0	.9	.2	35.3	
BOSTON TECH HIGH						
# STUDENTS	539	94	243	5	245	1126
% OF TOTAL	47.9	8.3	21.6	.4	21.8	
MARIO UMANA HARBOR						
# STUDENTS	591	106	103	3	216	1019
% OF TOTAL	58.0	10.4	10.1	.3	21.2	
BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	407	142	11	1	170	731
% OF TOTAL	55.7	19.4	1.5	.1	23.3	
COPLEY SQ HIGH						
# STUDENTS	282	64	40	6	119	511
% OF TOTAL	55.2	12.5	7.8	1.2	23.3	
RAFAEL HERNANDEZ						
# STUDENTS	48	121	1	1	29	200
% OF TOTAL	24.0	60.5	.5	.5	14.5	
HORACE MANN						
# STUDENTS	47	40	9		36	132
% OF TOTAL	35.6	30.3	6.8		27.3	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	28599	10438	4719	274	16674	60704
% OF TOTAL	47.1	17.2	7.8	.5	27.5	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

BROCKTON

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
DR W ARNONE COMM SCH						
# STUDENTS	116	199	34	6	397	752
% OF TOTAL	15.4	26.5	4.5	.8	52.8	
ASHFIELD						
# STUDENTS	81	44	21	2	452	600
% OF TOTAL	13.5	7.3	3.5	.3	75.3	
BROOKFIELD						
# STUDENTS	132	88	16	3	821	1060
% OF TOTAL	12.5	8.3	1.5	.3	77.5	
JOHN F KENNEDY						
# STUDENTS	25	5	2		601	633
% OF TOTAL	3.9	.8	.3		94.9	
EDGAR B DAVIS						
# STUDENTS	130	43	12		771	956
% OF TOTAL	13.6	4.5	1.3		80.6	
FRANKLIN						
# STUDENTS	31	9	5	1	300	346
% OF TOTAL	9.0	2.6	1.4	.3	86.7	
GILMORE						
# STUDENTS	162	13	2	8	349	534
% OF TOTAL	30.3	2.4	.4	1.5	65.4	
HANCOCK						
# STUDENTS	66	21	20	3	692	802
% OF TOTAL	8.2	2.6	2.5	.4	86.3	
HUNTINGTON						
# STUDENTS	68	30	9	1	477	585
% OF TOTAL	11.6	5.1	1.5	.2	81.5	
OSCAR F RAYMOND						
# STUDENTS	125	58	11	1	552	747
% OF TOTAL	16.7	7.8	1.5	.1	73.9	
GEORGE S PAINE						
# STUDENTS	92	36	18		165	311
% OF TOTAL	29.6	11.6	5.8		53.1	
WHITMAN						
# STUDENTS	13	7	6	1	258	285
% OF TOTAL	4.6	2.5	2.1	.4	90.5	
WINTHROP						
# STUDENTS	26	35	2	1	262	326
% OF TOTAL	8.0	10.7	.6	.3	80.4	
DOWNEY						
# STUDENTS	79	30	9		501	619
% OF TOTAL	12.8	4.8	1.5		80.9	
EAST JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	84	69	6	6	433	598
% OF TOTAL	14.0	11.5	1.0	1.0	72.4	
NORTH JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	91	33	6	7	523	660
% OF TOTAL	13.8	5.0	.9	1.1	79.2	
SOUTH JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	69	31	12	3	545	660
% OF TOTAL	10.5	4.7	1.8	.5	82.6	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

BROCKTON

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
WEST JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	46	24	21	2	637	730
% OF TOTAL	6.3	3.3	2.9	.3	87.3	
SUPPLEMENTARY SERV CTR						
# STUDENTS					10	10
% OF TOTAL					100.0	
PROJECT CLIMB						
# STUDENTS	1				23	24
% OF TOTAL	4.2				95.8	
HOME CLASS						
# STUDENTS	2				7	9
% OF TOTAL	22.2				77.8	
BROCKTON HIGH						
# STUDENTS	470	276	89	1	3477	4313
% OF TOTAL	10.9	6.4	2.1		80.6	
ITHAKA ALTERNATIVE HS						
# STUDENTS	5				37	42
% OF TOTAL	11.9				88.1	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	1914	1051	301	46	12290	15602
% OF TOTAL	12.3	6.7	1.9	.3	78.8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

CAMBRIDGE

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
AGASSIZ						
# STUDENTS	61	11	29	1	153	255
% OF TOTAL	23.9	4.3	11.4	.4	60.0	
M E FITZGERALD						
# STUDENTS	111	53	63	1	182	410
% OF TOTAL	27.1	12.9	15.4	.2	44.4	
FLETCHER						
# STUDENTS	83	88	4		209	364
% OF TOTAL	21.6	22.9	1.0		54.4	
HAGGERTY						
# STUDENTS	34	2	10		69	115
% OF TOTAL	29.6	1.7	8.7		60.0	
CHARLES G HARRINGTON						
# STUDENTS	136	81	17		387	621
% OF TOTAL	21.9	13.0	2.7		62.3	
KING						
# STUDENTS	182	31	54		283	550
% OF TOTAL	33.1	5.6	9.8		51.5	
LONGFELLOW						
# STUDENTS	43	129	25		280	477
% OF TOTAL	9.0	27.0	5.2		58.7	
MORSE						
# STUDENTS	121	25	23		176	345
% OF TOTAL	35.1	7.2	6.7		51.0	
PEABODY						
# STUDENTS	129	27	32	2	205	395
% OF TOTAL	32.7	6.8	8.1	.5	51.9	
ROBERT F KENNEDY						
# STUDENTS	62	33	3		192	290
% OF TOTAL	21.4	11.4	1.0		66.2	
ROBERTS						
# STUDENTS	109	61	9		182	361
% OF TOTAL	30.2	16.9	2.5		50.4	
JOHN M TOBIN						
# STUDENTS	197	57	41		321	616
% OF TOTAL	32.0	9.3	6.7		52.1	
GRAHAM/PARKS NEW ALTER						
# STUDENTS	148	24	5	1	166	344
% OF TOTAL	43.0	7.0	1.5	.3	48.3	
CAMB RINDGE + LATIN						
# STUDENTS	852	237	125	4	1416	2634
% OF TOTAL	32.3	9.0	4.7	.2	53.8	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	2268	859	440	9	4221	7797
% OF TOTAL	29.1	11.0	5.6	.1	54.1	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

FALL RIVER

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
HECTOR L bELISLE						
# STUDENTS			1		170	171
% OF TOTAL			.6		99.4	
N B BORDEN						
# STUDENTS	1		10		175	186
% OF TOTAL	.5		5.4		94.1	
BRAYTON AVENUE						
# STUDENTS	2	3			197	202
% OF TOTAL	1.0	1.5			97.5	
CHARLES V CARROLL						
# STUDENTS	1	2	3		326	332
% OF TOTAL	.3	.6	.9		98.2	
WILLIAM CONNELL						
# STUDENTS	5		1		172	178
% OF TOTAL	2.8		.6		96.6	
COUGHLIN						
# STUDENTS	1	3			155	159
% OF TOTAL	.6	1.9			97.5	
DAVOL						
# STUDENTS	2	2	1		181	186
% OF TOTAL	1.1	1.1	.5		97.3	
JOHN J DORAN						
# STUDENTS	3				272	275
% OF TOTAL	1.1				98.9	
JOHN J DORAN ANNEX						
# STUDENTS	1				163	164
% OF TOTAL	.6				99.4	
HUGO A DUBUQUE						
# STUDENTS	5	11	1		172	189
% OF TOTAL	2.6	5.8	.5		91.0	
FOWLER ELEM						
# STUDENTS					139	139
% OF TOTAL					100.0	
WILLIAM S GREENE						
# STUDENTS	2				160	162
% OF TOTAL	1.2				98.8	
FRANK M SILVIA						
# STUDENTS	6	3	19		256	284
% OF TOTAL	2.1	1.1	6.7		90.1	
HARRIET T HEALY						
# STUDENTS	5		1		246	252
% OF TOTAL	2.0		.4		97.6	
HIGHLAND						
# STUDENTS		1			168	169
% OF TOTAL		.6			99.4	
LAUREL LAKE						
# STUDENTS	9	1			271	281
% OF TOTAL	3.2	.4			96.4	
A S LETOURNEAU						
# STUDENTS	1				232	233
% OF TOTAL	.4				99.6	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

FALL RIVER

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
LEONTINE LINCOLN						
# STUDENTS	4	93	8		189	294
% OF TOTAL	1.4	31.6	2.7		64.3	
OSBORN STREET						
# STUDENTS	2	1			173	176
% OF TOTAL	1.1	.6			98.3	
SLADE						
# STUDENTS			1		279	280
% OF TOTAL			.4		99.6	
RALPH M SMALL						
# STUDENTS	5	3	3		333	344
% OF TOTAL	1.5	.9	.9		96.8	
SPENCER BORDEN						
# STUDENTS	3				145	148
% OF TOTAL	2.0				98.0	
JAMES TANSEY						
# STUDENTS	1	1	2		157	161
% OF TOTAL	.6	.6	1.2		97.5	
SAMUEL WATSON						
# STUDENTS	2				272	274
% OF TOTAL	.7				99.3	
WESTALL						
# STUDENTS	10	2	1		287	300
% OF TOTAL	3.3	.7	.3		95.7	
WILLIAM J WILEY						
# STUDENTS	5				162	167
% OF TOTAL	3.0				97.0	
SUSAN H WIXON						
# STUDENTS	6	3	2		299	310
% OF TOTAL	1.9	1.0	.6		96.5	
EDMOND P. TALBOT MIDDL						
# STUDENTS	7	2	10		692	711
% OF TOTAL	1.0	.3	1.4		97.3	
HENRY LORD MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	5		1		612	618
% OF TOTAL	.8		.2		99.0	
MORTON MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	9	1			753	763
% OF TOTAL	1.2	.1			98.7	
MATTHEW J KUSS MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	11	1	8		797	817
% OF TOTAL	1.3	.1	1.0		97.6	
B M C DURFEE HIGH						
# STUDENTS	27	7	27		2964	3025
% OF TOTAL	.9	.2	.9		98.0	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	141	140	100		11569	11950
% OF TOTAL	1.2	1.2	.8		96.8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

HOLYOKE

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
HIGHLAND						
# STUDENTS	34	232	10		220	496
% OF TOTAL	6.9	46.8	2.0		44.4	
KIRTLAND						
# STUDENTS	22	182		1	145	350
% OF TOTAL	6.3	52.0		.3	41.4	
LT ELMER J MCMAHON						
# STUDENTS	22	229	5		250	506
% OF TOTAL	4.3	45.3	1.0		49.4	
JOSEPH METCALF						
# STUDENTS	6	167	2		91	266
% OF TOTAL	2.3	62.8	.8		34.2	
MORGAN						
# STUDENTS	8	193	3		105	309
% OF TOTAL	2.6	62.5	1.0		34.0	
KELLY						
# STUDENTS	21	344	6		210	581
% OF TOTAL	3.6	59.2	1.0		36.1	
EDWARD N WHITE						
# STUDENTS	8	18	1		127	154
% OF TOTAL	5.2	11.7	.6		82.5	
LT CLAYRE SULLIVAN						
# STUDENTS	11	123	2		183	319
% OF TOTAL	3.4	38.6	.6		57.4	
MAURICE A DONAHUE						
# STUDENTS	19	72			75	166
% OF TOTAL	11.4	43.4			45.2	
DR WM R PECK						
# STUDENTS	40	391	5		483	919
% OF TOTAL	4.4	42.5	.5		52.6	
LAWRENCE ELEM						
# STUDENTS	27	416	1	1	204	649
% OF TOTAL	4.2	64.1	.2	.2	31.4	
JOHN J LYNCH JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	14	184	8		242	448
% OF TOTAL	3.1	41.1	1.8		54.0	
HOLYOKE HIGH						
# STUDENTS	57	433	18	1	920	1429
% OF TOTAL	4.0	30.3	1.3	.1	64.4	
WM J DEAN VOC.TECH HIG						
# STUDENTS	4	54	1		226	285
% OF TOTAL	1.4	18.9	.4		79.3	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	293	3038	62	3	3461	6877
% OF TOTAL	4.3	44.2	.9		50.6	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

LAWRENCE

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
LAWRENCE PRE-SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS		11			13	24
% OF TOTAL		45.8			54.2	
ARLINGTON						
# STUDENTS	5	250	6		77	338
% OF TOTAL	1.5	74.0	1.8		22.8	
JOHN BREEN						
# STUDENTS	14	300	20		226	560
% OF TOTAL	2.5	53.6	3.6		40.4	
ALEXANDER B BRUCE						
# STUDENTS	60	487	8	3	522	1080
% OF TOTAL	5.6	45.1	.7	.3	48.3	
JAMES F HENNESSEY						
# STUDENTS	22	325	6		151	504
% OF TOTAL	4.4	64.5	1.2		30.0	
J P KANE JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	21	138	35	1	427	622
% OF TOTAL	3.4	22.2	5.6	.2	68.6	
JAMES I LARLOR						
# STUDENTS	14	101			88	203
% OF TOTAL	6.9	49.8			43.3	
FRANCIS M LEAHY						
# STUDENTS	19	376	2		260	657
% OF TOTAL	2.9	57.2	.3		39.6	
JAMES F LEONARD						
# STUDENTS	9	373	9		326	717
% OF TOTAL	1.3	52.0	1.3		45.5	
OLIVER JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	20	636	22		216	894
% OF TOTAL	2.2	71.1	2.5		24.2	
JOHN R ROLLINS						
# STUDENTS	5	209	21		235	470
% OF TOTAL	1.1	44.5	4.5		50.0	
SALEM STREET SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	6	100	30		135	271
% OF TOTAL	2.2	36.9	11.1		49.8	
DANIEL SAUNDERS						
# STUDENTS	5	106	5	1	172	289
% OF TOTAL	1.7	36.7	1.7	.3	59.5	
JOHN K TARBOX						
# STUDENTS	11	371	9		104	495
% OF TOTAL	2.2	74.9	1.8		21.0	
EMILY G WETHERBEE						
# STUDENTS	6	58	12		227	303
% OF TOTAL	2.0	19.1	4.0		74.9	
LAWRENCE HIGH						
# STUDENTS	64	935	66		866	1931
% OF TOTAL	3.3	48.4	3.4		44.8	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	281	4776	251	5	4045	9358
% OF TOTAL	3.0	51.0	2.7	.1	43.2	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

LOWELL

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
CARDINAL OCONNELL						
# STUDENTS		38	6		176	220
% OF TOTAL		17.3	2.7		80.0	
COLBURN						
# STUDENTS	1	18	6		125	150
% OF TOTAL	.7	12.0	4.0		83.3	
E N ROGERS						
# STUDENTS	19	90	59		449	617
% OF TOTAL	3.1	14.6	9.6		72.8	
GREEN						
# STUDENTS	6	90	10	4	80	190
% OF TOTAL	3.2	47.4	5.3	2.1	42.1	
GREENHALGE						
# STUDENTS	8	35	130		409	582
% OF TOTAL	1.4	6.0	22.3		70.3	
JOSEPH G PYNE						
# STUDENTS			1		242	243
% OF TOTAL			.4		99.6	
LAURA E LEE						
# STUDENTS	1	5	6		59	71
% OF TOTAL	1.4	7.0	8.5		83.1	
ABRAHAM LINCOLN						
# STUDENTS	14	78	11		187	290
% OF TOTAL	4.8	26.9	3.8		64.5	
HUGH J MOLLOY						
# STUDENTS	8	34	67		247	356
% OF TOTAL	2.2	9.6	18.8		69.4	
CHARLES W MOREY						
# STUDENTS	15	18	100		565	698
% OF TOTAL	2.1	2.6	14.3		80.9	
LEBLANC SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	6	18			215	239
% OF TOTAL	2.5	7.5			90.0	
PAWTUCKETVILLE MEMORIA						
# STUDENTS	8	185	5		206	404
% OF TOTAL	2.0	45.8	1.2		51.0	
PINE STREET						
# STUDENTS			3		143	146
% OF TOTAL			2.1		97.9	
PETER W REILLY						
# STUDENTS	11	47	40		517	615
% OF TOTAL	1.8	7.6	6.5		84.1	
HENRY L ROBINSON						
# STUDENTS	18	100	69	2	499	688
% OF TOTAL	2.6	14.5	10.0	.3	72.5	
SHAUGHNESSY						
# STUDENTS	26	101	7		199	333
% OF TOTAL	7.8	30.3	2.1		59.8	
VARNUM						
# STUDENTS	9	91	1		280	381
% OF TOTAL	2.4	23.9	.3		73.5	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

LOWELL

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
WASHINGTON						
# STUDENTS	5	123	5		226	359
% OF TOTAL	1.4	34.3	1.4		63.0	
ARTS SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	17	26	4	1	100	148
% OF TOTAL	11.5	17.6	2.7	.7	67.6	
CITY SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	18	70	5		125	218
% OF TOTAL	8.3	32.1	2.3		57.3	
AMES STREET						
# STUDENTS	2	15	6		84	107
% OF TOTAL	1.9	14.0	5.6		78.5	
ELIOT SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	1	5			26	32
% OF TOTAL	3.1	15.6			81.3	
BARTLETT JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	24	160	98		417	699
% OF TOTAL	3.4	22.9	14.0		59.7	
BUTLER JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	12	57	1		136	206
% OF TOTAL	5.8	27.7	.5		66.0	
JAMES S DALEY JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	16	56	129		666	867
% OF TOTAL	1.8	6.5	14.9		76.8	
MOODY JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	3	11	2		274	290
% OF TOTAL	1.0	3.8	.7		94.5	
JOSEPH A MCAVINNUE						
# STUDENTS	3	2	15		495	515
% OF TOTAL	.6	.4	2.9		96.1	
LOWELL HIGH						
# STUDENTS	62	237	300	2	2076	2677
% OF TOTAL	2.3	8.9	11.2	.1	77.5	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	313	1710	1086	9	9223	12341
% OF TOTAL	2.5	13.9	8.8	.1	74.7	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

LYNN

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
ABORN						
# STUDENTS	4	1	3		260	268
% OF TOTAL	1.5	.4	1.1		97.0	
A DREWICZ ELEM						
# STUDENTS	21	15	10		389	435
% OF TOTAL	4.8	3.4	2.3		89.4	
BRICKETT ELEMENTARY						
# STUDENTS	28	8	2		308	346
% OF TOTAL	8.1	2.3	.6		89.0	
JULIA F CALLAHAN						
# STUDENTS	50	38	9		289	386
% OF TOTAL	13.0	9.8	2.3		74.9	
COBBET ELEMENTARY						
# STUDENTS	60	50	2		277	389
% OF TOTAL	15.4	12.9	.5		71.2	
COMMUNITY DAY SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	5				34	39
% OF TOTAL	12.8				87.2	
WM P CONNERY						
# STUDENTS	78	40	13		193	324
% OF TOTAL	24.1	12.3	4.0		59.6	
E J HARRINGTON						
# STUDENTS	60	115	9		232	416
% OF TOTAL	14.4	27.6	2.2		55.8	
HIGHLAND						
# STUDENTS	39	17	4	1	394	455
% OF TOTAL	8.6	3.7	.9	.2	86.6	
HOOD						
# STUDENTS	32	28	6		410	476
% OF TOTAL	6.7	5.9	1.3		86.1	
INGALLS						
# STUDENTS	96	115	12	1	304	528
% OF TOTAL	18.2	21.8	2.3	.2	57.6	
LINCOLN						
# STUDENTS	13	14			165	192
% OF TOTAL	6.8	7.3			85.9	
LYNN WOODS						
# STUDENTS	4	1	4		165	174
% OF TOTAL	2.3	.6	2.3		94.8	
SEWELL-ANDERSON						
# STUDENTS	2	1			189	192
% OF TOTAL	1.0	.5			98.4	
CAPT WILLIAM G SHOEMAK						
# STUDENTS	5	1			162	168
% OF TOTAL	3.0	.6			96.4	
EDWARD A SISSON						
# STUDENTS	6	3	3		429	441
% OF TOTAL	1.4	.7	.7		97.3	
TRACY						
# STUDENTS	13	4	1		333	351
% OF TOTAL	3.7	1.1	.3		94.9	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

LYNN

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
WASHINGTON COMMUNITY						
# STUDENTS	81	66	88		175	410
% OF TOTAL	19.8	16.1	21.5		42.7	
BREED JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	64	59	8		555	686
% OF TOTAL	9.3	8.6	1.2		80.9	
EASTERN JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	71	92	39		441	643
% OF TOTAL	11.0	14.3	6.1		68.6	
PICKERING JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	14	4	1	3	404	426
% OF TOTAL	3.3	.9	.2	.7	94.8	
ASTOR						
# STUDENTS	1	1			4	6
% OF TOTAL	16.7	16.7			66.7	
CLASSICAL HIGH						
# STUDENTS	112	34	7	2	628	783
% OF TOTAL	14.3	4.3	.9	.3	80.2	
LYNN ENGLISH HIGH						
# STUDENTS	71	91	59		1396	1617
% OF TOTAL	4.4	5.6	3.6		86.3	
VOC TECH INSTITUTE						
# STUDENTS	62	58	4		833	957
% OF TOTAL	6.5	6.1	.4		87.0	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	992	856	284	7	8969	11108
% OF TOTAL	8.9	7.7	2.6	.1	80.7	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

MEDFORD

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
COLUMBUS						
# STUDENTS	5		1		131	137
% OF TOTAL	3.6		.7		95.6	
LORIN L DANE						
# STUDENTS	4	2	7		322	335
% OF TOTAL	1.2	.6	2.1		96.1	
GEORGE DAVENPORT						
# STUDENTS	2	3	12		236	253
% OF TOTAL	.8	1.2	4.7		93.3	
FOREST PARK						
# STUDENTS	3		1		158	162
% OF TOTAL	1.9		.6		97.5	
FRANKLIN						
# STUDENTS	3			2	216	221
% OF TOTAL	1.4			.9	97.7	
GLEASON						
# STUDENTS	2	2			200	204
% OF TOTAL	1.0	1.0			98.0	
JOHN F KENNEDY ELEM						
# STUDENTS	5	3	6		518	532
% OF TOTAL	.9	.6	1.1		97.4	
OSGOOD						
# STUDENTS	5	3	5		241	254
% OF TOTAL	2.0	1.2	2.0		94.9	
SWAN ELEMENTARY						
# STUDENTS	6	1	5		314	326
% OF TOTAL	1.8	.3	1.5		96.3	
HOBBS JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	111	5	7		389	512
% OF TOTAL	21.7	1.0	1.4		76.0	
MILTON FULLER ROBERTS						
# STUDENTS	4	4	2		306	316
% OF TOTAL	1.3	1.3	.6		96.8	
MEDFORD HIGH						
# STUDENTS	88	4	16		1559	1667
% OF TOTAL	5.3	.2	1.0		93.5	
CURTIS-TUFTS						
# STUDENTS	1				33	34
% OF TOTAL	2.9				97.1	
MEDFORD VOC TECH HIGH						
# STUDENTS	14				425	439
% OF TOTAL	3.2				96.8	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	253	27	62	2	5048	5392
% OF TOTAL	4.7	.5	1.1		93.6	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

METHUEN

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
ASHFORD						
# STUDENTS	5	1	7		217	230
% OF TOTAL	2.2	.4	3.0		94.3	
STEPHEN BARKER						
# STUDENTS	1	3			192	196
% OF TOTAL	.5	1.5			98.0	
CENTRAL ELEMENTARY						
# STUDENTS	6	123	6		362	497
% OF TOTAL	1.2	24.7	1.2		72.8	
HOME						
# STUDENTS	1	1	9		216	227
% OF TOTAL	.4	.4	4.0		95.2	
MARSH						
# STUDENTS	3	8	2		314	327
% OF TOTAL	.9	2.4	.6		96.0	
MARSH SCHOOL (OLD)						
# STUDENTS	1				77	78
% OF TOTAL	1.3				98.7	
OAKLAND						
# STUDENTS	1	13	1	1	198	214
% OF TOTAL	.5	6.1	.5	.5	92.5	
PLEASANT VALLEY						
# STUDENTS	3	3	3		205	214
% OF TOTAL	1.4	1.4	1.4		95.8	
METHUEN EAST MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	6	80	14		741	841
% OF TOTAL	.7	9.5	1.7		88.1	
TENNEY MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	5	16			779	800
% OF TOTAL	.6	2.0			97.4	
METHUEN HIGH						
# STUDENTS	6	41	6		1515	1568
% OF TOTAL	.4	2.6	.4		96.6	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	38	289	48	1	4816	5192
% OF TOTAL	.7	5.6	.9		92.8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

NEW BEDFORD

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
CHARLES S ASHLEY						
# STUDENTS	3	6	2		369	380
% OF TOTAL	.8	1.6	.5		97.1	
ELIZABETH CARTER BROOK						
# STUDENTS	73	8	4		217	302
% OF TOTAL	24.2	2.6	1.3		71.9	
ELWYN G CAMPBELL						
# STUDENTS	61	52	1		217	331
% OF TOTAL	18.4	15.7	.3		65.6	
JAMES B CONGDON						
# STUDENTS	13	4			345	362
% OF TOTAL	3.6	1.1			95.3	
SGT WM H CARNEY ACAD						
# STUDENTS	273	64	6	1	343	687
% OF TOTAL	39.7	9.3	.9	.1	49.9	
JOHN B DEVALLES						
# STUDENTS	9	11			545	565
% OF TOTAL	1.6	1.9			96.5	
GEORGE H DUNBAR						
# STUDENTS	17	8			129	154
% OF TOTAL	11.0	5.2			83.8	
ALFRED J. GOMES						
# STUDENTS	219	96	6		411	732
% OF TOTAL	29.9	13.1	.8		56.1	
JOHN HANNIGAN						
# STUDENTS	10	23			345	378
% OF TOTAL	2.6	6.1			91.3	
ELLEN R MATHAWAY						
# STUDENTS	63	19			212	294
% OF TOTAL	21.4	6.5			72.1	
HAYDEN/MCFADDEN						
# STUDENTS	40	159	1		752	952
% OF TOTAL	4.2	16.7	.1		79.0	
HORATIO A KEMPTON						
# STUDENTS	19	1			127	147
% OF TOTAL	12.9	.7			86.4	
ABRAHAM LINCOLN						
# STUDENTS	6	3			374	383
% OF TOTAL	1.6	.8			97.7	
MT PLEASANT						
# STUDENTS	88	52	3		205	348
% OF TOTAL	25.3	14.9	.9		58.9	
SARAH D OTTINELL						
# STUDENTS	14	15	2		460	491
% OF TOTAL	2.9	3.1	.4		93.7	
JOHN AVERY PARKER						
# STUDENTS	57	47			377	481
% OF TOTAL	11.9	9.8			78.4	
PHILLIPS AVENUE						
# STUDENTS		7			210	217
% OF TOTAL		3.2			96.8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

NEW BEDFORD

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
CASMIR PULASKI						
# STUDENTS	25	30	3		422	480
% OF TOTAL	5.2	6.3	.6		87.9	
THOMAS R RODMAN						
# STUDENTS	50	9	1		157	217
% OF TOTAL	23.0	4.1	.5		72.4	
JIREH SWIFT						
# STUDENTS	7	4			187	198
% OF TOTAL	3.5	2.0			94.4	
WILLIAM H TAYLOR						
# STUDENTS		1			270	271
% OF TOTAL		.4			99.6	
BETSEY B WINSLOW						
# STUDENTS	14		1		342	357
% OF TOTAL	3.9		.3		95.8	
KEITH JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	158	91	2	4	498	753
% OF TOTAL	21.0	12.1	.3	.5	66.1	
NORMANDIN JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	35	51			778	864
% OF TOTAL	4.1	5.9			90.0	
ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	74	61	5		569	709
% OF TOTAL	10.4	8.6	.7		80.3	
NEW BEDFORD HIGH						
# STUDENTS	414	261	8	4	2537	3224
% OF TOTAL	12.8	8.1	.2	.1	78.7	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	1742	1083	45	9	11398	14277
% OF TOTAL	12.2	7.6	.3	.1	79.8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

REVERE

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
AUGUSTINE C WHELAN MEM						
# STUDENTS	10	8	7		695	720
% OF TOTAL	1.4	1.1	1.0		96.5	
BEACHMONT						
# STUDENTS	1	12	67		540	620
% OF TOTAL	.2	1.9	10.8		87.1	
ABRAHAM LINCOLN						
# STUDENTS		5	2		604	611
% OF TOTAL		.8	.3		98.9	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY						
# STUDENTS	8	8	3		288	307
% OF TOTAL	2.6	2.6	1.0		93.8	
PAUL REVERE						
# STUDENTS	3		9		406	418
% OF TOTAL	.7		2.2		97.1	
JAMES A GARFIELD						
# STUDENTS	3	15	194		338	550
% OF TOTAL	.5	2.7	35.3		61.5	
REVERE HIGH						
# STUDENTS	5	2	82		1407	1496
% OF TOTAL	.3	.1	5.5		94.1	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	30	50	364		4278	4722
% OF TOTAL	.6	1.1	7.7		90.6	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

SALEM

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
BATES						
# STUDENTS	1	53	2		305	361
% OF TOTAL	.3	14.7	.6		84.5	
BENTLEY						
# STUDENTS	4	54	5		173	236
% OF TOTAL	1.7	22.9	2.1		73.3	
CARLTON						
# STUDENTS	6	1		4	151	162
% OF TOTAL	3.7	.6		2.5	93.2	
HORACE MANN LABORATORY						
# STUDENTS	22	80	7		477	586
% OF TOTAL	3.8	13.7	1.2		81.4	
WITCHCRAFT HEIGHTS						
# STUDENTS	15	22	10		468	515
% OF TOTAL	2.9	4.3	1.9		90.9	
MIDDLE SCHOOL WEST						
# STUDENTS	15	32	5		610	662
% OF TOTAL	2.3	4.8	.8		92.1	
MIDDLE SCHOOL EAST						
# STUDENTS	5	62	6	1	211	285
% OF TOTAL	1.8	21.8	2.1	.4	74.0	
SALEM HIGH						
# STUDENTS	27	143	10		1072	1252
% OF TOTAL	2.2	11.4	.8		85.6	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	95	447	45	5	3467	4059
% OF TOTAL	2.3	11.0	1.1	.1	85.4	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

SPRINGFIELD

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
ARMORY STREET						
# STUDENTS	109	183	12		233	537
% OF TOTAL	20.3	34.1	2.2		43.4	
THOMAS M BALLIET						
# STUDENTS	128	10	2		164	304
% OF TOTAL	42.1	3.3	.7		53.9	
SAMUEL BOWLES						
# STUDENTS	79	132			197	408
% OF TOTAL	19.4	32.4			48.3	
BRIGHTWOOD						
# STUDENTS	70	263			124	457
% OF TOTAL	15.3	57.5			27.1	
ELIAS BROOKINGS						
# STUDENTS	139	225	13	1	181	559
% OF TOTAL	24.9	40.3	2.3	.2	32.4	
DANIEL B BRUNTON						
# STUDENTS	190	9	1		249	449
% OF TOTAL	42.3	2.0	.2		55.5	
WILLIAM N DEBERRY						
# STUDENTS	161	169	1		79	410
% OF TOTAL	39.3	41.2	.2		19.3	
HIRAM L DORMAN						
# STUDENTS	167	65			167	399
% OF TOTAL	41.9	16.3			41.9	
MARGARET C ELLS						
# STUDENTS	99	39			76	214
% OF TOTAL	46.3	18.2			35.5	
GLENWOOD						
# STUDENTS	73	174	1		110	358
% OF TOTAL	20.4	48.6	.3		30.7	
ALFRED M GLICKMAN						
# STUDENTS	121	27	2		158	308
% OF TOTAL	39.3	8.8	.6		51.3	
FRANK H FREEDMAN						
# STUDENTS	75	32	3		141	251
% OF TOTAL	29.9	12.7	1.2		56.2	
FREDERICK HARRIS						
# STUDENTS	75	15			199	289
% OF TOTAL	26.0	5.2			68.9	
HOMER STREET						
# STUDENTS	204	37	1		113	355
% OF TOTAL	57.5	10.4	.3		31.8	
HOWARD ST						
# STUDENTS	118	180	10		73	381
% OF TOTAL	31.0	47.2	2.6		19.2	
INDIAN ORCHARD ELEM						
# STUDENTS	108	55	3		252	418
% OF TOTAL	25.8	13.2	.7		60.3	
KENSINGTON AVENUE						
# STUDENTS	145	61	9		263	478
% OF TOTAL	30.3	12.8	1.9		55.0	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

SPRINGFIELD

		BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
LIBERTY							
	# STUDENTS	83	78	2		202	365
	% OF TOTAL	22.7	21.4	.5		55.3	
LINCOLN							
	# STUDENTS	45	404	5		123	577
	% OF TOTAL	7.8	70.0	.9		21.3	
MEMORIAL							
	# STUDENTS	55	15			191	261
	% OF TOTAL	21.1	5.7			73.2	
MARY M LYNCH							
	# STUDENTS	88	63	1		148	300
	% OF TOTAL	29.3	21.0	.3		49.3	
MARY O POTTENGER							
	# STUDENTS	111	241	3		191	546
	% OF TOTAL	20.3	44.1	.5		35.0	
SIXTEEN ACRES							
	# STUDENTS	92	125			248	465
	% OF TOTAL	19.8	26.9			53.3	
SUMNER AVENUE							
	# STUDENTS	127	76	11		225	439
	% OF TOTAL	28.9	17.3	2.5		51.3	
ARTHUR T TALMADGE							
	# STUDENTS	119	16	4		168	307
	% OF TOTAL	38.8	5.2	1.3		54.7	
ALICE B BEAL SCHOOL							
	# STUDENTS	43	14	2		170	229
	% OF TOTAL	18.8	6.1	.9		74.2	
WARNER							
	# STUDENTS	139	31	2		198	370
	% OF TOTAL	37.6	8.4	.5		53.5	
WASHINGTON							
	# STUDENTS	103	48	2		269	422
	% OF TOTAL	24.4	11.4	.5		63.7	
WHITE STREET							
	# STUDENTS	88	127	1		214	430
	% OF TOTAL	20.5	29.5	.2		49.8	
NEW NORTH COMMUNITY SC							
	# STUDENTS	204	566	4		316	1090
	% OF TOTAL	18.7	51.9	.4		29.0	
CHESTNUT STREET JR HIG							
	# STUDENTS	120	664	4		168	956
	% OF TOTAL	12.6	69.5	.4		17.6	
JOHN J DUGGAN JR HIGH							
	# STUDENTS	329	98	6		256	689
	% OF TOTAL	47.8	14.2	.9		37.2	
FOREST PARK JR HIGH							
	# STUDENTS	217	187	8	2	529	943
	% OF TOTAL	23.0	19.8	.8	.2	56.1	
JOHN F KENNEDY JR HIGH							
	# STUDENTS	227	77	3		317	624
	% OF TOTAL	36.4	12.3	.5		50.8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SPRINGFIELD

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
M MARCUS KILEY JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	281	26	1	5	629	942
% OF TOTAL	29.8	2.8	.1	.5	66.8	
VAN SICKLE JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	289	297	14		354	954
% OF TOTAL	30.3	31.1	1.5		37.1	
ALTERNATIVE JR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	23	17	1		28	69
% OF TOTAL	33.3	24.6	1.4		40.6	
CLASSICAL HIGH						
# STUDENTS	348	57	30		1120	1555
% OF TOTAL	22.4	3.7	1.9		72.0	
HIGH SCHOOL OF COMMERC						
# STUDENTS	531	417	10		396	1354
% OF TOTAL	39.2	30.8	.7		29.2	
TECHNICAL HIGH						
# STUDENTS	441	243	6		148	838
% OF TOTAL	52.6	29.0	.7		17.7	
MASS CAREER DEV. INST						
# STUDENTS	6	11	1		3	21
% OF TOTAL	28.6	52.4	4.8		14.3	
PUTNAM VOC TECH HIGH S						
# STUDENTS	343	290	2		712	1347
% OF TOTAL	25.5	21.5	.1		52.9	
SHRINERS HOSPITAL						
# STUDENTS		10			8	18
% OF TOTAL		55.6			44.4	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	6513	5874	181	8	10110	22686
% OF TOTAL	28.7	25.9	.8		44.6	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

WORCESTER

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
ADAMS STREET						
# STUDENTS	38	35	1	2	103	179
% OF TOTAL	21.2	19.6	.6	1.1	57.5	
BELMONT STREET COMMUNI						
# STUDENTS	49	301	10	1	217	578
% OF TOTAL	8.5	52.1	1.7	.2	37.5	
WAHECUS ROAD SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	3	3	1		181	188
% OF TOTAL	1.6	1.6	.5		96.3	
BURNCOAT STREET						
# STUDENTS	60	68		6	200	334
% OF TOTAL	18.0	20.4		1.8	59.9	
CANTERBURY STREET						
# STUDENTS	40	28	93		216	377
% OF TOTAL	10.6	7.4	24.7		57.3	
CHANDLER ELEM COMMUNIT						
# STUDENTS	46	136	3	1	132	318
% OF TOTAL	14.5	42.8	.9	.3	41.5	
CLARK ST COMMUNITY						
# STUDENTS	60	95	4		258	417
% OF TOTAL	14.4	22.8	1.0		61.9	
COLUMBUS PARK						
# STUDENTS	62	79	3		227	371
% OF TOTAL	16.7	21.3	.8		61.2	
DARTMOUTH STREET						
# STUDENTS	5	7	43		257	312
% OF TOTAL	1.6	2.2	13.8		82.4	
DOWNING STREET						
# STUDENTS	26	49	3		166	244
% OF TOTAL	10.7	20.1	1.2		68.0	
FLAGG STREET						
# STUDENTS	8		3		445	456
% OF TOTAL	1.8		.7		97.6	
ELM PARK COMMUNITY						
# STUDENTS	80	154	38	5	252	529
% OF TOTAL	15.1	29.1	7.2	.9	47.6	
FREELAND STREET						
# STUDENTS	6	17	4		221	248
% OF TOTAL	2.4	6.9	1.6		89.1	
GAGE STREET						
# STUDENTS	38	64	6	1	128	237
% OF TOTAL	16.0	27.0	2.5	.4	54.0	
GATES LANE						
# STUDENTS	7	4	7		402	420
% OF TOTAL	1.7	1.0	1.7		95.7	
GRAFTON STREET						
# STUDENTS	12	19			197	228
% OF TOTAL	5.3	8.3			86.4	
GRANITE STREET						
# STUDENTS	4	9	5		156	174
% OF TOTAL	2.3	5.2	2.9		89.7	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WORCESTER

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
GREENDALE						
# STUDENTS	3	2			333	338
% OF TOTAL	.9	.6			98.5	
HARLOW STREET						
# STUDENTS	36	45	6	2	172	261
% OF TOTAL	13.8	17.2	2.3	.8	65.9	
HEARD STREET						
# STUDENTS	6	6	5		174	191
% OF TOTAL	3.1	3.1	2.6		91.1	
LAKE VIEW						
# STUDENTS	13	5	1		262	281
% OF TOTAL	4.6	1.8	.4		93.2	
LINCOLN STREET						
# STUDENTS	35	92			120	247
% OF TOTAL	14.2	37.2			48.6	
NEW LUDLOW						
# STUDENTS	5	1	5		161	172
% OF TOTAL	2.9	.6	2.9		93.6	
MAY STREET						
# STUDENTS	9	4	13		303	329
% OF TOTAL	2.7	1.2	4.0		92.1	
FRANCIS J MCGRATH ELEM						
# STUDENTS	7	11	1		254	273
% OF TOTAL	2.6	4.0	.4		93.0	
MIDLAND STREET						
# STUDENTS	3	6	5		271	285
% OF TOTAL	1.1	2.1	1.8		95.1	
MILL SWAN						
# STUDENTS	25	28			140	193
% OF TOTAL	13.0	14.5			72.5	
MILLBURY ST						
# STUDENTS	5		1	1	148	155
% OF TOTAL	3.2		.6	.6	95.5	
NELSON PLACE						
# STUDENTS	9	10	5	1	415	440
% OF TOTAL	2.0	2.3	1.1	.2	94.3	
NORRBACK AVENUE						
# STUDENTS	15	15	3		156	189
% OF TOTAL	7.9	7.9	1.6		82.5	
QUINSIGAMOND						
# STUDENTS	25	32	2		250	309
% OF TOTAL	8.1	10.4	.6		80.9	
RICE SQUARE						
# STUDENTS	1	6	4		358	369
% OF TOTAL	.3	1.6	1.1		97.0	
ROOSEVELT						
# STUDENTS	7	9			130	146
% OF TOTAL	4.8	6.2			89.0	
ST NICHOLAS AVE COMM S						
# STUDENTS	10	181			192	383
% OF TOTAL	2.6	47.3			50.1	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OCTOBER 1, 1985 TABLE 3 ENROLLMENT BY RACE

WORCESTER

	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN	AM IND	WHITE	TOTAL
TATNUCK						
# STUDENTS	20	19	1	1	346	387
% OF TOTAL	5.2	4.9	.3	.3	89.4	
THORNDYKE ROAD						
# STUDENTS	19	47		2	203	271
% OF TOTAL	7.0	17.3		.7	74.9	
UNION HILL SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	33	40	5		396	474
% OF TOTAL	7.0	8.4	1.1		83.5	
WEST TATNUCK						
# STUDENTS	6	11	4		289	310
% OF TOTAL	1.9	3.5	1.3		93.2	
WOODLAND ST COMMUNITY						
# STUDENTS	53	222	4	7	156	442
% OF TOTAL	12.0	50.2	.9	1.6	35.3	
VERNON HILL SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	7	19	3		420	449
% OF TOTAL	1.6	4.2	.7		93.5	
BURNCOAT MIDDLE SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	26	188	4	7	414	639
% OF TOTAL	4.1	29.4	.6	1.1	64.8	
FOREST MIDDLE SCHOOL						
# STUDENTS	44	61	18	2	620	745
% OF TOTAL	5.9	8.2	2.4	.3	83.2	
WORCESTER EAST MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	53	67	38		533	691
% OF TOTAL	7.7	9.7	5.5		77.1	
SULLIVAN MIDDLE						
# STUDENTS	46	59	5	1	404	515
% OF TOTAL	8.9	11.5	1.0	.2	78.4	
BURNCOAT SENIOR HIGH						
# STUDENTS	49	167	19		822	1057
% OF TOTAL	4.6	15.8	1.8		77.8	
DOHERTY MEMORIAL HIGH						
# STUDENTS	100	109	64	3	1083	1359
% OF TOTAL	7.4	8.0	4.7	.2	79.7	
NORTH HIGH						
# STUDENTS	59	98	15	4	816	992
% OF TOTAL	5.9	9.9	1.5	.4	82.3	
SOUTH HIGH COMMUNITY						
# STUDENTS	84	161	13		1003	1261
% OF TOTAL	6.7	12.8	1.0		79.5	
DISTRICT TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	1357	2789	468	47	15102	19763
% OF TOTAL	6.9	14.1	2.4	.2	76.4	
TOTALS						
# STUDENTS	44829	33427	8456	425	124691	211828
% OF TOTAL	21.2	15.8	4.0	.2	58.9	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We want to thank the following people for their cooperation in the preparation of these individual school profiles:

BOSTON

Superintendent Laval S. Wilson
Charlotte Harris - Senior Coordinator/External Grants
Jeanne Glynn - Chapter 636 Coordinator/District B

Henry L. Higginson School - Leo J. Conway
Joseph Lee School - Frances C. Kelly
Solomon Lewenberg Middle School - Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
Angelo Giacalone

CAMBRIDGE

Superintendent Robert S. Peterkin
Dorothy S. Jones - Desegregation Director

Michael E. Fitzgerald School - Richard Calnan
Charles G. Harrington School - Frances X. Foley
Henry Wadsworth Longfellow School - Margaret Carroll

HOLYOKE

Superintendent George W. Counter
Robert O'Neill - Desegregation Director
Felicita M. El-Ghadi - Magnet Program Director

Kelly School - Alphonso Laudato
McMahon School - George Hamel
Morgan School - Daniel M. Doherty

LOWELL

Superintendent Henry J. Mroz
George N. Tsapatsaris - Desegregation Director

Arts Magnet School - J. Peter Downing
- E. Lorraine Burgoyne
Greenhalge Magnet School - Frederick P. Gallagher, Jr.
- Albert R. Guimond
- Mary S. Nugent

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEW BEDFORD

Superintendent Constantine T. Nanopoulos
Diane Souza - Desegregation Director

SPRINGFIELD

Superintendent Thomas J. Donahoe
Gary Roberts - Chapter 636 Evaluator
Vivian G. George - Supervisor, Chapter 636

Armory Street School - James R. Moriarty
Indian Orchard School - Ann Dryden
White Street School - John M. Fizgerald

WORCESTER

Superintendent John E. Durkin
Thomas P. Friend - Associate Superintendent
Roland E. Charpentier - Desegregation Director
Alice A. Leonardi - Administrative Assistant

Adams Street East Side
Preparatory School - Shirley Saffy
Burncoat Middle School - Thomas Durkin
Elm Park Community School - Alexander Radzik